AN

AGREEMENT

BETWEEN THE

Church of England

AND

Church of Rome,

Evinced from the

Concertation of ſome of Her Sons

With their BRETHREN the

DISSENTERS.

Publiſhed with Allowance.

LONDON,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Moſt Excellent Majeſty, for His Houſhold and Chappel; And are to be ſold at his Printing-houſe on the Ditch-ſide in *Black-Fryers*. 1687.

THE PREFACE.

THERE *having been of late a great* Cry, *that the* Clergy *of the Church of* England, *are* now *the chief, if not the only Oppoſers of* Popery, *and* Defenders *of the Proteſtant* Religion, *the* Author *of the Enſuing Treatiſe knowing it to be an unlucky Miſtake in regard to ſome Principal Men of their late Writers, he reſolved, if poſſible, to undeceive the unwary* Readers *of Books*

at this time, by acquainting them with the avowed Principles of ſome of our Clergy *about thoſe Points, wherein the very life of Popery conſiſts, and, on which the whole Syſtem of that Religion is founded: In doing which, he hath, with ſome clearneſs, demonſtrated the Agreement of Opinion between the Church of* England *Men, and the Church of* Rome, *to be ſo exact and full, that, if the Government ſhould ſo deſign, it were but* dictum factum, *according to their Doctrin, and a* Caſſandrian *Peace might be patch'd up preſently with* Rome: *But his Majeſty being more concerned, for the Eaſe and Quiet of all his People, than for the Gratification of a few, will admit of no ſuch Accommodations, for He is reſolved*

on

on another, a more glorious Deſign (viz.) A Liberty of Conſcience, *that may render ſatisfaction to All.*

However, to put ſome check to the inſulting talk of our Clergy, who would be thought to be the only Champions againſt Popery, 'tis become neceſſary in the preſent juncture to Emit ſuch an Eſſay, as this, which may be of ſome Advantage, in ſetting matters right between the two Churches; for, it is pretty evident, that the Church of England, *muſt either freely declare, that as to the particulars inſtanced in, ſhe is Agreed with the* Romaniſt; *and that the Controverſie lies only between the Church of* Rome, *and the* Proteſtant Diſſenter; *or ſhe muſt honeſtly renounce*

nounce the Principles, *ſhe has cleaved unto, when any of her Sons wrote againſt the* Nonconformiſts, *and confeſs, that ſhe hath been Perſecuting them, for their firm adherence unto* Proteſtant Doctrins.

Whoever will take the help this Author gives us, to ſearch into the very Bowels of this Controverſie, he will (unleſs his prejudices be too inveterate) ſoon ſee, that ever ſince the breach between the Church of England *and the* Proteſtant Diſſenter *has had it's Being, we have left us nothing but the* Name, *the* ſhadow *of a* Proteſtant Church *of* England, *and that ſo far as ſhe differs from the* Proteſtant Diſſenter, *ſhe agrees with the* Roman Catholic. *And for this Reaſon it*

is

is humbly propoſed to our Nobility, and Gentry, who renounce the Name *of a* Roman Catholic, *to conſider how they can any longer* Honorably *do ſo, unleſs they not only favour, but cloſe with, the* Proteſtant Diſſenter, *and with regret reflect, how againſt* Reaſon *they have hitherto been ſo very ſevere both againſt the* Papiſt *and the* Diſſenter, *even when they themſelves muſt be eſteemed, upon what is ſaid, to have embraced the* Principles *of the One, or of the Other.*

There is one thing more to be obſerved, That as the Author has been very juſt in his Quotations, which he was neceſſitated to uſe, in ſhewing the Reader *the Conceſſions of the* Engliſh Clergy; *ſo, leſt any*

ſhould

ſhould ſay, That this is only the Senſe of a few, there is added a Sheet or Two, drawn up by another Hand, to prove, That all who eſpouſe the Principles of the Church of England, *as She is ſet up in Oppoſition to the Proteſtant Diſſenter, muſt hold what Theſe do grant.*

An

An agreement between the Church of *England* and Church of *Rome*, Evinced from the Concertation of ſome of her Sons with their Brethren the Diſſenters.

THE INTRODUCTION.

THERE hath been of late a very great Conteſt, between the *Roman Catholic* and the Church of *England* about Religion; and, for ought I ſee, they are not yet agreed touching the very *State* of the Controverſie. The *Papiſts* complain of *Miſ-repreſentation*, and until this be yielded they'l not Diſpute. The Church of *England* will not grant any ſuch thing *properly*, and in a ſtrict Senſe. And thus for ſome Months there has been nothing but Anſwering, Replying, Re-

joyning, and Sur-rejoyning, and we are ſtill where we began.

As for my part I think it neceſſary, that in the firſt place a *juſt ſtate* of the Controverſie be ſetled, that the World know, wherein the contending Parties *Agree*, and how far they *differ*. And that this debate may be brought to ſome Iſſue, it ſhall be my Province to ſhew wherein they are *agreed*, leaving it to ſome abler Pen to proſecute this matter, and diſcover clearly wherein the *Difference* between them doth lie. Not that I deſign the encumbring this Diſcouſe with a Catalogue of Agreements in the great Doctrins of Chriſtian Religion, and matters of Opinion. For both the *Council of Trent* and our *Engliſh Convocation* have taken eſpecial care by a Latitude of expreſſion to obtain the Aſſent of Men, who vaſtly differ in their Opinions. and on this account it is, that in both Churches there are Men of very different Opinions about ſeveral Points of Religion, who yet ſubſcribe the ſame Articles of Faith and are ſtill of the ſame Church; thus amongſt the Romaniſts about the great Doctrin of *Predetermination*, there are the *Durandiſts*, *Dominicans*, *Janſeniſts*, *Moliniſts*, and *Scotiſts*, that very much differ in *Opinion*, and yet are ſtill of the ſame Church; and about this very thing there are in the Church of *England*, *Calviniſts*, *Arminians*, *Socinians*, and *Antinomians*, who ſubſcribe the ſame Articles of Religion, as Terms of Unity and Peace, whereabout they vaſtly diſagree in Opinion.

I will therefore confine my ſelf to the *Agreement* there

there is between both Churches about *Government* and *Worſhip*, which chiefly concerns Mens Practices; and will ſhew what light has broken forth from a Colliſion of thoſe two great parties of *Proteſtants*, the *Church of England*, and the *Diſſenter*: For in the writings of the Church of *England* againſt their *Diſſenting Brethren*, an *Agreement* between the Roman Catholic, and the Church of *England* about Church *Government*, and ſome parts of *Worſhip* will be found exact, and full. For as his late Majeſty has obſerv'd, 'The 'Church of *England* dares not bring the true ar-'guments againſt the other Sects, for fear they 'ſhould be turn'd againſt themſelves and be confut-'ed by their own Arguments.

The Truth of this is ſufficiently demonſtrated by ſome late Champions of the Engliſh Church, who have been bold enough to ſpeak out: For as I ſhall prove, they have made uſe of thoſe Arguments againſt the Diſſenter, which, by a rebound, will deſtroy themſelves, and have eſpouſed ſome of thoſe very Principles about *Church-Government* and *Worſhip*, which have been defended by the Roman Catholic againſt the Old Proteſtant.

To clear up this much we muſt deſcend to the very bottom of the Controverſie between the Church of *England*, and the Proteſtant Diſſenter about the preſent Separation, which in ſhort lies here. The Aſſertion of the Church of *England* is, That the Diſſenter in ſeparating from their Church are *guilty of a Damning Schiſm*. And to prove this, ſeveral attempts have been

made, but in their own Opinion all without ſucceſs, until of late they fixed on a Principle, which I ſhall in theſe Papers prove to be Roman Catholic.

That they might compaſs their deſign, two things muſt be done. In the firſt place they muſt prove the Diſſenters to be under an *Obligation* of holding Communion with their Church in the Pariſh Aſſemblies, unleſs ſhe impoſed ſomewhat ſinful as terms of Communion. And Secondly, That the Terms of her Communion are not ſinful. The evincing the firſt was (ſhe ſaw) neceſſary, becauſe as Dean *Stillingfleet* obſerves. 'A Man is not ſaid to ſeparate from every 'Church where he forbears or ceaſeth to have 'Communion; but only from that Church 'with which he is *obliged* to hold Communi-'on and yet withdraws from it. And the vindicating the Terms of their Communion became alſo as neceſſary; for if ſhe made any thing ſinful, a Term of Communion, ſeeing no Man may venture to do evil that good may come thereof, no Obligation could lie on any to hold Communion with her. Theſe two things then muſt be cleared up, and the Church of *England* hath laboured hard to do it; and we will be diſtinct in our Examination of what has been inſiſted on, and ſhew that the laſt reſult has been a Cloſure with the Roman Catholic. 1. About the *Government of the Church*, and 2. About *Worſhip*.

Unreaſonableneſs of Separation, *p.* 156.

SECT.

SECT. I.

The Church of Englands *closure with a Roman Catholic Principle about the Government of the Church in proving the Diſſenter to lie under an Obligation of Holding Communion with her.*

IF the Diſſenters be under an Obligation of holding Communion with the Church of *England*, it muſt be becauſe they are bound to do ſo, either by *Private contract* only, or by *Human Authority*, or by what is *Divine*. If it be from *Conſent*, or *Private contract* only, then muſt all thoſe, that never conſented to hold Communion with their Church be cleared of this Guilt; and if we may believe Dr. *Sherlock*, thoſe who do conſent and afterwards withdraw, tho' they are guilty of a great evil, yet not of *Schiſm*; but if the Charge of Schiſm be founded on the Authority of the Magiſtrate, who enjoyns us to Communicate with ſuch a Church, tho' to diſobey our Governours in lawful things be a very great Evil, yet, as the ſame Author obſerves, it is not in it ſelf the evil of Schiſm, but of Diſobedience to Lawful Authority. Theſe two ways then, wherein others go to prove the Diſſenters Schiſmatics, are yielded as inſufficient to their pur-

Vindication of the Defence of Dean *Stillingfleet*, pa. 8. 9.

purpose, and therefore they stand altogether upon the *last*, affirming that the Dissenters are by *Divine Authority* oblig'd to fix their Communion with the Church of *England*. And that they may prove it, they have (as I said but now) fix'd on a Roman Catholic Principle; which will with much clearness appear to those, who will but carefully and without prejudice consult their Notion, and compare it with what the Papists hold about the Government of the Church. In stating their Notion I must have recourse to the writings of Dr. *Sherlock*, who with the approbation and applause of the Church of *England* Clergy in the Defence of her great Champion Dean *Stillingfleet*, has setled the ensuing Doctrin about the Church's Government.

Vindication of Defence of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, *pa.* 36. and 37.

1. 'The Catholic Church is one Body, one 'Society, one Houshold and Family, one King-'dom.

And that we may the better understand what is meant by these expressions, they explain themselves, first by supposing the whole World to be but one great Family or Universal Kingdom, and then by telling us, that just so 'tis with the Catholic Church. And seeing all know, that to make the whole World one Universal Kingdom it's necessary that it be subjected under *one Governing Head*, it unavoidably follows, That unless in the Catholic Church there be *One Supreme Governing Head*, it cannot be like unto an Universal Kingdom, an Organized Politic Body. One Kingdom, One Government, and One Governing Head do mutually infer each other. Thus a Family

Family has one Governing Head, and for the ſame reaſon ſo it muſt be with the Catholic Church Viſible, it muſt have one Viſible Governing Head.

2. 'That all the Chriſtians, and Chriſtian 'Churches in the World, which make up but one 'Body, Society, or Church, is called *Catholic Communion.* *Ibid* p. 54.

3. 'That there is ſomewhat more neceſſary 'to Catholic Communion than an Agreement 'in the ſame Faith, the ſame Rules of Worſhip 'and right Adminiſtration of the Sacraments. 'For ſpeaking of Schiſmatics, it's ſaid, that tho' 'they believe the ſame Articles of Faith, obſerve 'the ſame Rules of Worſhip, have the ſame Sa- 'craments rightly and duly adminiſtred among 'them, excepting their Schiſm, yet nothing of 'all this will avail them to Salvation, unleſs 'they return to the *Communion* of the Catholic 'Church.

4. 'That what is further neceſſary to Catholic 'Communion is a *Catholic Government*, namely, 'the *Epiſcopal.* To prove that the Unity of the Catholic Church conſiſts in one Communion, it is aſſerted, 'that all the Biſhops of the Church are 'but *One* alſo, inveſted with the ſame Power and 'Authority to Govern the Church; That all 'theſe Biſhops are but One Body, who are bound 'to live in Communion with each other and to 'Govern their reſpective Churches, when need 'requires and where it can be had, by mutual ad- 'vice and conſent; and that no Biſhops are abſo- 'lutely Independent, but are obliged to preſerve Pag. 122 123.

'the

'*the Unity of the Epiſcopacy* whereon the Unity 'and Communion of the Catholic Church de- 'pends.

Pag. 126. 5. 'The Power of every Biſhop in his own 'Dioceſe is not ſo *Abſolute, and Independent*, but 'that he is bound to preſerve the Unity of the 'Epiſcopacy, and to live in Communion with his 'Collegues, and Fellow Biſhops; for this is the '*Foundation of Catholic Communion*, without which 'there can be no Catholic Church. And this is 'the Foundation of all thoſe greater Combinations 'of Churches, and that Authority which is re- 'gularly exerciſed over particular Biſhops by their

Pag. 124. 'Collegues. The whole Authority of a Biſhop 'or Council over other Biſhops, is Founded on the 'Laws of Catholic Communion, which is the 'great end it ſerves, and therefore they have no

Pag. 155. '*proper Authority, but only in ſuch matters, as con-* '*cern the Unity of the Epiſcopacy, or the Peace and* '*Communion of the Catholic Church.* Again, the '*Unity* of the Epiſcopacy is the Foundation of 'theſe larger Combinations, and Confederacies 'of Neighbour Churches, which make Archie- 'piſcopal or National Churches; for ſince there is 'but *One* Epiſcopacy, it is highly *reaſonable and ne-* '*ceſſary, that ſo far as it is practicable*, they ſhould 'all act and Govern their reſpective Churches 'as *One* Biſhop, with one conſent, which is the 'moſt effectual way to ſecure the Peace and Unity 'of the Epiſcopal Colledge, and to promote the 'Edification and good Government of the Church. 'Nay this *Unity* of the Epiſcopacy is the Founda- 'tion of that Authority, which Neighbour Bi-

'ſhops

'ſhops have over their Collegues in caſe of Hereſie 'and Schiſm, or any notorious wickedneſs, for 'they being Biſhops of the Univerſal Church 'have an Original Right and Power to take care, 'that no part of the Church, which is within their 'reach and inſpection, ſuffer by the Hereſie or 'evil Practices of their Collegues.

They diſtinguiſh I do confeſs between Caſes *Extraordinary*, and *Ordinary*: and by caſes Ordinary they underſtand matters of *leſſer* moment, and importance: and by Caſes Extraordinary what concerns the Purity of the Faith, and Manners, and Catholic Unity. And in theſe great caſes, Neighbour Biſhops have *proper Authority* over their Collegues, and whatever Biſhops ſhall wilfully refuſe to obſerve the Decrees and Canons of Councils, made up of the Catholic Biſhops, without manifeſt neceſſity, for not doing it, would be guilty of ſuch Pride and Obſtinacy as would fall very little ſhort of the guilt of Schiſm; for the very conſent and Agreement of Biſhops among themſelves is ſo great a good to the Church of God, that *that* alone is ſufficient to determin a *Good Man*, when there are not very weighty reaſons againſt it.

6. 'The College of Biſhops may grant unto Pag. 127. 'ſome *One* Biſhop a *Primacy* for the preſervation Pag. 184. 'of Catholic Unity and Communion, who, by a 'general conſent, may be intruſted with a Superi- 'or Power of *Calling Synods*, *Receiving Appeals*, 'and *exerciſing ſome peculiar Acts of Diſcipline* 'under the regulation of Eccleſiaſtical Canons. Thus much the Doctor applies to Metropolitans,

but reaches the case of the Universal Church as well, as I will prove in it's proper place.

Pag. 396. 7. 'A compliance with the Order, Govern-
'ment, Discipline, and Worship, as well as the
'Doctrin of the Catholic Church is necessary to
'Catholic Communion. For all Christians and
Pag. 38. 39. 'Christian Churches are but *One* Body, and are
'thereby obliged to all Duties, Offices and
'Acts of Christian Communion, which are con-
'sequent, upon such a Relation. The Catholic
'Church is One Body, and Society, wherein all
'the Members thereof have equal Right and *Ob-*
'*ligation to Christian Communion.*

This is the Foundation, on which they ground the charge of Schism against Dissenters, and the *Argument*, which they raise to confirm what they would be at, may be thus form'd.

What Christian soever separates from that Church, with which he is bound to hold Communion, is guilty of Schism.

But the Protestant Dissenter separates from that Church, with which he is bound to hold Communion. Ergo, The *Protestant Dissenter is guilty of Schism.*

This is their Argument: and that they may prove the Protestant Dissenter *bound* to hold Communion with the Church of *England*, they run to the Laws of Catholic Communion, assuring us, that the Catholic Church is but as *One* Family, one Kingdom, and that wherever any Christian removes his Dwelling, whatever particular Church he goes to, he is still in the same Family, the same Kingdom, the same Church, and has the same Rights and Privileges and the same Obligation

to

to Communion. Whoever therefore dwell in this Kingdom, and have been Baptiz'd and not Excommunicate, are Members of the Church of *England*, and bound to hold Communion with it, and that not only by profeſſing the ſame Faith, worſhipping God in the ſame way, and owning the ſame Sacraments; but moreover by *ſubmitting to the Catholic Government* of the Church, which is by Biſhops, and all thoſe, who either deny the Catholic Church to be one Govern'd Society, Houſhold, or Kingdom, or refuſe to ſubmit unto the *Epiſcopal* Government, are guilty of a *Damning Schiſm*; and becauſe the Proteſtant Diſſenters are guilty in one or other of theſe reſpects, they are Schiſmatics.

Thus much I take to be a fair State of their notion as improv'd againſt the Diſſenter; but then I muſt add, that this is the very ſame with what is embrac'd by thoſe of the Roman Catholic Communion, and, if we trace it a while we ſhall find it lodg'd under St. *Peters Chair*; for, by their making the Catholic Church, one Body, one Houſhold, one Kingdom, or Governed Society, that has a Governing and Governed Part, they muſt neceſſarily be for a *Catholic Hierarchy*, as what alone is a fit Government for ſo Great a Body Politic. Let us therefore a little more cloſely obſerve what theſe Church of *England* Clergy-Men affirm, and we ſhall find their Notion about Church Government exactly form'd according to the *Roman Model*; for they ſay, That there can be no *One* Catholic Communion without *One* Catholic Government. And that Catholic Unity and Com-

munion may be the more ſecurely preſerv'd, the Combination of Churches, conſidered as pure Eccleſiaſtical Societies, into Archiepiſcopal, or National Churches, is neceſſary; ſo that the great end of the Combination of *Dioceſan* into Provincial and National Churches, is the Preſerving Catholic Communion; which cannot be but by the raiſing the Combination *higher*, and extending it much farther, even unto Patriarchal, and at laſt unto one *Oecumenical Combined Church*, for this alone is commenſurate to Catholic Communion. Beſides, Catholic Communion as it muſt be in the ſame Faith, the ſame Worſhip and Government, ſo it muſt *be among all Chriſtians throughout the Catholic Church*, and therefore cannot be obtain'd, when only among a few in *one Nation*. And that this Combination of Churches muſt extend farther than the bounds and limits of a Nation, they alſo grant, when they tell us, 'That a National Church is bound to
Vind. pa. 159. 'maintain Catholic Communion with Neighbour
'Churches, and if it fall into Hereſie, or Schiſm,
Defence pa. 211. 212. 'Neighbour Churches, [that is, the Churches
'of other Nations] may and ought to *Admoniſh*,
'and *cenſure* them: That the Original right and
'Power of Biſhops is in relation to the *whole*
'*Church*, which they may reaſſume, when they
'ſee occaſion for it, and which obliges them to
'take care as *far as poſſibly they can*, that the
'Church of Chriſt ſuffer no injury by the Hereſie,
'or evil Practices of any of their Collegues. Tho'
'equals have no Superiority over one another,
'yet a College hath Authority and Command
'over

'over *any* of it's Collegues. To this let us add another Aſſertion of theſe Gentlemen, '*Catholic* Vind. p. 196.
'*Communion is a Divine Inſtitution, and therefore*
'*the Combination of Churches for Catholic Com-*
'*munion is Divine alſo.* And what follows from all this; but that ſeeing a Combination of *many* National Churches into one Patriarchate is a more effectual way to preſerve the Peace and Unity of the Catholic Church, than the combination of Provincial Churches into a National, a Patriarchal combination is more agreeable to the Laws of Catholic Communion, and more grounded on a Divine Inſtitution, and for the ſame reaſon a Combination of Patriarchal Churches into one Oecumenical Church muſt be acknowledged to be alſo founded on Catholic Communion and on a Divine Inſtitution? Furthermore, by the ſame Laws of Catholic Communion, as all the Biſhops within a Provincial Church muſt meet for Government, having a *Direct Authority* over their Collegues; ſo it is the Duty of the Biſhops of a Nation, and of a Patriarchate, and at laſt of the whole Catholic Church, to come together, that as far as it is *practicable* they may Govern their reſpective Churches as *One Biſhop*, with *one conſent*. And thus it is that the Canons of General Councils are become a great *Medium* and excellent Vind. p. 168.
inſtrument of Catholic Communion, the promoting of which is their principal end and greateſt uſe; but can have no Authority over any Biſhops, who refuſe to conſent, *unleſs* it be in ſuch matters as concern the *Purity of Faith and Manners, or Catholic Unity*: ſo that in theſe matters the General

Council

Council has a *direct Authority* over Diſſenting Biſhops, who are obliged, notwithſtanding their own different apprehenſions about theſe points, to ſubmit unto the *Authoritative deciſion* of the General Council, and thus much they muſt do to prevent the guilt of ſuch Pride and Obſtinacy as falls not very ſhort of the Guilt of Schiſm; which ſeems to be as much as would content the Lord of *Condom*. For the Authority of the Council's laſt Sentence is not to be Attributed unto the word of God taken in it ſelf, but as interpreted by the Sovereign Tribunal of the Church, which gives this *final reſolution*. On this occaſion it is that the Church of *England* doth Anathematize all Diſſenters with an *ipſo facto* Excommunication, upbraiding them for ſetting up their own giddy brains, as the beſt interpreters of Scripture, telling 'em that 'tis not left to every Phantaſtical Mans Head to believe as he pleaſes; that their pretence of Conſcience is no other than what Schiſmatics may pretend to.

Thus much the late King obſerv'd, and therefore with invincible ſtrength againſt the Church of *England*, he urgeth this, That the only Arguments ſhe can bring againſt Diſſenters, will recoyl againſt themſelves, for by preſſing her *Authority* againſt them, ſhe muſt fix on a Principle that is Roman Catholic, and thereby put her ſelf out of a Capacity of Defending her ſelf againſt that Church. The Authority that ſhe inſiſts on is that of the Catholic Biſhops Aſſembled in Council, which, as I will ſhew, gives up the cauſe to the Papiſts, about the Power of General Councils: But

But do they ſtop here? No, they go further, even to the acknowledging, that *this Council, or College of Catholic Biſhops may entruſt One or More with a Primacy*, and *give unto him a Superior Power of calling Synods, receiving Appeals, and exerciſing ſome peculiar Acts of Diſcipline* in the Vacancy of Councils, under the conduct of Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions, and all this for the effectual ſecuring of the Peace and Unity of the Catholic Church: whereby they juſtifie the *Pope*'s being the *Exordium Unitatis*, according to Archbiſhop *Bramhall*'s explicit acknowledgment in his Vindication of the Church of *England*, where he ſaith, 'We do con-'feſs, That the primitive Papacy, that is, an *Ex-'ordium Unitatis, a beginning of Unity*, was an ex-'cellent means of Concord. 'We do not envy the '*Biſhop of Rome* any Honor which the Catholic 'Church did allow him. Edit. *Dub.* 1677. p. 270.

Thus at laſt we find their Doctrin lodg'd in St. *Peter*'s Chair.

To be more particular, the *Agreement between the two Churches* lies in ſeveral Inſtances.

1. They both make the *Catholic Church* one Viſible, Governed Society, Houſhold, or Kingdom.

2. They both pitch upon the Epiſcopal Government as diſtributed into the ſeveral Subordinations of Combined Churches, as what is by Divine Inſtitution made the Government of this Church; a Combination of *Dioceſan* Churches to make up one *Provincial*, whoſe Biſhops are in Subordination to their *Metropolitan*; a Combination of Provincial Churches to make up a National, and the Metro-

Metropolitans in Subordination to the Primate; a Combination of National Churches to make up a Patriarchal, and the Primates in Subordination to the Patriarch; and a Confederacy of Patriarchal to make up one Oecumenical, and every Patriarch in Subordination to the Oecumenical Bishop, or chief Patriarch.

That thus much is the Doctrin of these Church of *England* Clergy-men, I have prov'd; and not one doubts but that the Church of *Rome* holds the same.

3. They both agree in giving unto a General Council *Direct Authority* over their Collegues in matters that concern the *Purity of Faith and Manners*, and the *Unity of the Church*. And,

4. They both agree to give unto *One Bishop a Primacy*, for the better preserving Catholic Union; and also a Superior Power of calling Synods, receiving Appeals, and exercising some peculiar Acts of Discipline under the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Canons. And it's my present business to prove, that a very great part (if not the greatest part) of the Roman Catholic Church do limit the Authority of General Councils unto *Matters of Faith, Unity of the Church, and Reformation of Manners*; and grant to the *Pope*, but *a Primacy for the sake of Catholic Concord*, and a Superior Power of calling Synods or Councils, receiving Appeals, and of exercising some peculiar Acts of Discipline under the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Canons.

In the first place I will begin with the *Gallican* Church, which owned the Councils of *Constance* and

and *Basil*, by which it's decreed, *That a General Council, representing the Catholic Church, has receiv'd Power immediately from Christ, unto which every one, of what Estate and Dignity soever, tho' he be of the Papal, is bound to obey in those things which concern the Faith, the Extirpation of Schism, and the general Reformation in the Church of God in the Head and Members.* That the Pope is but the *Principium Unitatis*, made Primate for the preservation of the Unity of the Catholic Church, and under the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Canons. And in the Council of *Basil* it's express, That all persons, of what State or Degree soever, tho' of the Papal, who refuse to obey the Commands, Statutes, Orders, or Precepts of this holy Synod, or of any other General Council lawfully assembled, shall, unless he repent, suffer condign punishment. And in the twelfth Session of this Council, where is the *Decretum citationis contra Papam*, it's asserted, That the Catholic Church has very often corrected and censured those *Popes*, that have deviated from the Faith, or have been guilty of notorious wickedness: And in matters wherein the Faith was in danger, or Christian Religion like to suffer by the Roman Pontiffs, the Catholic Church would never spare them.

concil. Const. Sess. 4. in Ordine.

concil. Basil. Sess. 3.

Besides, the *French* Church were vehement Assertors of the *Pragmatic Sanction*, and judg'd the Primacy of St. *Peter*'s *Chair* to be no other than what was for the preservation of the Unity and Communion of the Catholic Church, still holding that the *Primacy* was not so essential to Catholic Communion, but that *It* might be

Vide Epist. Synod. Basil. Responsal. ad invect. fact. sub nomine Eugenii *contra Synod. &c.*

Gerson's Conclusions, which had the approbation of seve-

veral *Italian* Doctors.

preſerv'd without ſuch a Primate; nor was the Pope greater than the whole Univerſal Church, tho' greater than particular Churches and Biſhops; and that the Ἐπιείκεια, or Authority that is granted him in the Interval of Councils about the *Declaring*, *Interpreting*, and *Moderating* the ſenſe of their Statutes or Canons, according as the various neceſſities of the Times may require for the good of the Church, doth not in the leaſt ſuppoſe him to have any Superiority or Preheminence above the Univerſal Church; whence it is, that whenever from the Eccleſiaſtical Courts in *France* any *References*, *Suggeſtions*, or *Conſultations* were made to the Pope, if the Pope's Reſcripts were contrary to the Old Canons, the French always look'd on it as *Abuſive*, and made an *Appeal* from the *Pope*, called *Appellatio ab abuſu*, provoking him to the Old Canons.

Electio Papæ finaliter ordinatur ad Unionem Eccleſiæ. Gerſon *de ſtatibus Eccleſ.*

All this is ſo fully aſſerted by the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, by the Renowned *John Gerſon* the Chancellor of *Paris*, by the *Pragmatic Sanction*, and by all the Famous Lawyers of *France*; eſpecially by *Leſchaſſerius*, *Carolus Molinæus*, *Ludovicus Servinus*, *Duarenus*, *&c.* that whoever has any tolerable Acquaintance with theſe matters, cannot but be abundantly ſatisfied in the truth of all this. However, Dr. *Sherlock* is bold enough to deny all, and to bring no leſs perſon than the Learned *Peter de Marca* for his Voucher. And becauſe it's a matter of no ſmall moment, I will give you the Doctor's own words: 'I preſume '(ſaith he) *Petrus de Marca*, the Learned Arch-'biſhop of *Paris*, who wrote in *Defence of the Liber-*

Leſchaſ. de Libert. Antiqu. & Canon. Eccleſ. Gallic. Molin. Monarch. Duar. de Sacr. Eccleſ. Miniſt. & Benef. lib. 5. c. 11. Defenſ. pro libert. Eccleſ. Gallic.

Vindic. p. 136.

'*Liberties of the Gallican Church*, is a good competent Witneſs in this matter; and yet in his 'Book *de Concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii*, which 'met with ſo many Cenſures at *Rome*, and ſo difficultly paſs'd the Teſt, and kept him ſo long out 'of his Biſhopric, he aſſerts the Authority of the 'Pope much higher than either of thoſe Councils, [*viz. Conſtance* and *Baſil.*] And to ſhorten 'my Work, I ſhall only ſet down ſome Propoſitions, which he himſelf collected out of his Book, 'in anſwer to the *Roman Cenſure*.

'1. That the Biſhop of *Rome* has always exerciſed the chief Power in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs in the '*Gallican* Churches ever ſince Chriſtianity flouriſh'd there.

'2. That the Pope is the Head of the Univerſal Church by *Divine Right*, and therefore of the '*Gallican* Church, which is a Member of the Univerſal Church.

'3. That the General *Decretals* of the *Roman* 'Biſhops have been ſent into *France* as well as into 'other Provinces, and received with great applauſe 'by the *Roman* Emperors, and the *French* Kings, 'from the firſt Foundation of that Kingdom till this 'preſent Age.

'4. That no Crime is a ſufficient reaſon for depoſing the Pope, except the public Profeſſion of 'Hereſie; and that this is true, he proves by the 'Teſtimony of the Ancients; and beſides ſhews, 'that it has been of old the Judgment and Definition of the *Gallican* Church.

'5. That the Pope can effectually and lawfully 'diſpenſe with the Canons of General Councils,

'even without any cauſe, ſo long as ſuch a Diſ-
'penſation doth not weaken the State of the
'Church.

'6. That the Liberties of the *Gallican* Church
'conſiſt in the Uſe and Practice of *Canons* and
'*Decretals*, both *Ancient* and *Modern*; and is
'not confined only to the Practice of *Ancient*
'Canons, where he ſhews, that at ſeveral times,
'in caſe of Neceſſity, Popes have proceeded to
'make New Laws for the public Good of the
'Church.

'7. That the Pope, beſides his *Primacy* over
'the Univerſal Church, is the only One and im-
'mediate Patriarch of the Weſtern and *Gallican*
'Churches; and that Kings have no Power to
'erect any new Biſhopric, Metropolitical Seat,
'much leſs a Patriarchate. This is a brief Scheme
'of *French Popery*, as it reſpects the Government
'of the Church, if we believe this great Archbiſhop.
So far the Doctor.

But what Reply can be made to this? for if this be as *Juſt*, as it is ſaid to be, a brief Scheme of *French Popery*, the *Church-of-England* Clergy muſt be clear'd from the charge of *Agreeing* with the *French Papiſt* about the Government of the Church. This is therefore, I confeſs, a confounding Objection, which with much clearneſs doth ſhew, that there is ſome *Miſrepreſenting* in the caſe, and it becomes me to make the beſt Defence I can; and therefore I am reſolv'd in the firſt place, for greater ſecurity, to confront the Repreſentation this Dr. has made of the Archbiſhop of *Paris* with the Teſtimony of the Archbiſhop of *Armagh*,

Armagh, the Learned *Bramhall*, a ſtout Defender of the ſame Cauſe which Dr. *Sherlock* has undertaken: And what ſaith he? Take his own words. A juſt Vindication of the Church of *England*, p. 109.

'From *Germany* (ſaith he) our paſs is open 'into *France*, where the caſe is as clear as the Sun, 'how their Kings (tho' acknowledged by the 'Popes themſelves to be Moſt Chriſtian, the 'Eldeſt Sons of the Church, and otherwiſe the 'great Patrons and Protectors of the *Roman See*) 'with their Princes of the Blood, their Peers, 'their Parliaments, their Ambaſſadors, their 'Schools and Univerſities, have all of them in all 'Ages affronted and curbed the *Roman Court*, and 'reduced them to a right Temper and Conſtitu-'tion, as often as they deviated from the *Canons* 'of the *Fathers*, and encroached upon the Liber-'ties of the *Gallican* Church; whereby the Pope's 'Juriſdiction in *France* came to be meerly *diſcre-'tionary*, at the pleaſure of the King. *Furthermore he adds*, 'That *Charles* VII. made the *Pragmatical 'Sanction* to confirm all the Acts of the Councils of '*Conſtance* and *Baſil*; and amongſt the ſeveral Li-'berties of the *French* Church, the Archbiſhop 'mentions theſe: The Courts of Parliament, in 'caſe of Appeals, as from Abuſe, have Right and 'Power to declare null, void, and revoke the 'Pope's Bulls and Excommunications, and to for-'bid the Execution of them, when they are found 'contrary to Sacred Decrees, the Liberties of the 'French Church, or the Prerogative-Royal; Ge-'neral Councils are above the Pope, and may de-'poſe him, and put another in his place, and take cog-

'cognizance of Appeals from the Pope; All Bi-'shops have their Power immediately from Christ, 'and not from the Pope, and are equally Succes-'sors of St. *Peter* and the other Apostles; All those 'are not Heretics, Excommunicated, or Damned, 'who differ in some things from the Doctrin of 'the Pope, who appeal from his Decrees, and 'hinder the Execution of the Ordinances of him 'or his Legats. So far Archbishop *Bramhall*, who 'confirms all I have said of *French Popery*. Where-fore, having so great a Pillar of the Church of *England* on my side, I may now venture the more boldly to examin this daring Doctor, who, a Thousand to One, will be found the *Misrepre-senter*; for it's not to be doubted but that *De Marca* too well understood the Liberties of the *French Church*, to give us such an Account of 'em as this Doctor pretends, and that therefore it must be the Doctor, who, either maliciously, or through ignorance, has *misrepresented him*; and this I will distinctly prove.

1. The Doctor saith, *That* Peter De Marca *wrote in Defence of the Liberties of the Gallican Church*, which is *one Misrepresentation* to begin with; for tho' *De Marca* wrote of the *Liberties* of the *Gallican Church*, yet he wrote not in their *Defence*, but so much against the *Pragmatic Sanction* which confirm'd them, that *Fagetus*, *De Marca*'s own Kinsman, called him a Deserter and Betray-er of the *Gallican* Liberties. And *Marca* himself was very much surprized to hear that any at *Rome* should dislike any thing he had written on this Subject; nor could he imagine what could tempt any

Desertorem ac proditorem facit Libertatum Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ. Balus *in vita* Petr. de Marca, *p.* 9.

any man to think that he had ſpoken the leaſt word in favor of the *French* Liberties to the prejudice of the *Roman* Chair, unleſs the putting the words [*De Libertatibus Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ*] into the Title page, which was done on the requeſt of the Printer, who hop'd that the ſound of theſe words would make the Book the more ſaleable; and it's probable enough that our Doctor, not ſearching much further than into the Title-pages and Margins of Books, might take it for granted that *Marca* writes in *Defence* of the *Gallican* Liberties, becauſe he ſaw in the Title, *De Libertatibus Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ.* But,

Offendit tamen (quis crederet) hic liber Romana ingenia, nullam aliam ob cauſam, ut Marca exiſtimabat, quàm quòd in fronte operis admoneret hîc agi de Libertatibus Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ.

2. That *De Marca*, who was brought up under thoſe who were of the *Society of Jeſus*, and a great Enemy to the *Janſeniſts*, and therefore at that time devoted to aſſert the *Prerogatives* of St. *Peter's Chair*, did valiantly oppoſe the *Pragmatic Sanction* by which the *Gallican* Liberties were ſecured, I will by an induction of uncontroulable inſtances evince.

Baluzius, who was an Intimate of *De Marca*, and to whom *Marca* committed the care of his Papers, is very poſitive; affirming, That none amongſt the *French*, no, nor among the *Spaniſh* or *Italian*, did more eloquently, and with greater Authority of the Ancients, exalt the *Roman Chair* to a greater heighth than *De Marca* did. And *De Marca* himſelf takes ſpecial care to aſſure the *Roman* Court how much he had engaged himſelf in this Deſign. In his Anſwer to the Notes ſent him from *Holſtenius* by Cardinal *Grimaldi*, the Pope's Legat in *France*, he tells us, That it was matter

Baluz. *Vit.* De Marc. *pag.* 9.

matter of aſtoniſhment unto him to find himſelf accuſed for writing what might reflect on the *Roman Chair*; for nothing was ſo much deteſted by him as any ſuch thing, it being his endeavor to do his utmoſt to exalt it. And in his Anſwer to the *Roman Cenſure*, it's aſſerted, That he was far from deſigning the leaſt harm to the Right of the Apoſtolical Seat, or Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction; and he thought it was paſt doubt that he had ſtrenuouſly endeavored to *Reſtore* the Authority of the Church; And that he had impugned thoſe Rules that had been introduced into the *Secular* Courts by the *Pragmatics*. And in his Letter to Cardinal *Barbarini*, *De Marca* tells us, That he had carefully oppugned thoſe Rules the Pragmatics uſed to defend the *Gallican* Liberties by, as moſt pernicious to the Apoſtolical Chair, and had ſetled *contrary Definitions*, confirmed by ſuch new and illuſtrious Arguments, as might, he thought, gain him ſome Reſpect at *Rome*. And in his Anſwer to *Holſtenius* and the *Roman Cenſure*, and in a little Book which he wrote to explain himſelf, and in a *Schedule* tender'd to the *Romans*, he deſires, That the Poſitions of the moſt celebrated Lawyers in the *Gallican* Courts, which indeed reflected on the Apoſtolical Chair, might be compared with thoſe *Definitions*, which amongſt ſo many Magiſtrates and Theologues he was the *firſt* Aſſertor of, and he doubted not but he ſhould be ſufficiently vindicated from the Reproach of *Defending the Gallican* Liberties, or of caſting the leaſt contempt on the Roman Chair. He would inculcate this,

this, and therefore tells us, that the most Eminent Authors in *France*, who were of the Roman Communion, such as *Carolus Molinæus*, *Fauchetius*, *Pasquierius*, *Pithæus*, *Hotmannus*, *Servinus*, and other Asserters of the *Gallican* Liberties taught quite contrary unto him: For 'twas asserted by them,

1. 'That the Roman Pontiffs never exercised 'any Authority in the *French* Church, before the 'sixth Century.

2. 'The King alone, and not the Pope, did 'preside as Head of the *Gallican* Church.

3. 'That the Pope has no power to make Laws 'to oblige the French.

4. 'That the Pope may be Deposed *à dignitate*, *& à sede*, if he be guilty of any great scandal.

5. 'That the Pope may not, on any pretence 'whatsoever, make Laws, or dispense with 'any contrary to the Canons of General Coun-'cils.

6. 'That the Liberties of the *Gallican* Church 'consist in the use of the Antient Right compre-'hended in the old Canons, and that it belongs 'to the Highest Courts in *France* to restore that 'use by Parliamentary Decrees, or Arrests.

7. 'That if the Pope will not accomodate him-'self to the Regal Constitutions, the French have 'a Right to set up a chief Patriarch.

8. 'That the King may make Laws in mat-'ters Ecclesiastical, and that such Laws are of 'the same force and strength with those in Ci-'vil Affairs.

9. 'That it belongs to the Supreme Courts 'of *France* to determin, in matters of *Appeal ab* 'abuſu, and to judge in a Principal matter, that is 'Eccleſiaſtical, as has been oft done in their 'Courts.

In theſe Poſitions we have a full account of the *Gallican Liberties*, agreeable to what was Decreed by the Councils of *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, and confirm'd by the *Pragmatic Sanction*. But theſe are oppos'd by *Peter de Marca*, and contrary Poſitions Eſtabliſhed by him, to the Exaltation of the Prerogatives of the Roman Chair.

And this was agreeable to the deſign of the Arch-biſhop, who undertook to reconcile the differences between the French Church and the Church of *Rome*, a noble, but very difficult, enterprize, which he ſaw could not be done by entring on the Merits of the Cauſe, and therefore all matters of Diſpute he wav'd, and contented himſelf with giving an Hiſtory of matter of Fact, with ſome new Interpretations of ſome paſſages of Antiquity, leaving many things doubtful, that, if poſſible, he might eſcape both *Scylla* and *Charybdis*. Which deſign that he might the more effectually compaſs, he in the firſt Tome of his Works falls in with the *Concordate*, that was more pleaſing to *Rome* than the *Pragmatic* Sanction, but not pleaſing enough; and therefore ſome at *Rome* were greatly diſguſted with him (tho' *Marinoneus*, a Man of excellent Learning, thought it deſerv'd highly from the Apoſtolic Seat) and as Dr. *Sherlock* truly ſaith, kept him long out of his Biſhopric; for

he

he could find no favour at *Rome* until he had collected out of his writing, those Propositions that were destructive to the *Gallican Liberties*, and had submitted his Book to the Roman Chair, which he mentions in the very Title of his little Book, to which was also added [*Reges Canonum Custodes, non verò Auctores*] desiring that it might be considered, that when he published his Book he was of another Profession, of which, none had written so much for the Rights of the Roman Church, as he had done; but now being of the Clergy, he solemnly promis'd to approve himself an Asserter and Defender of the Prerogatives of the Apostolical Chair, and offer'd four Arch-bishops and eight of the most eminent Bishops in *France* to undertake for him; and after this he finds favour at *Rome* and is in great esteem with the Pope, and at last is honour'd with the Arch-bishopric of *Paris*.

This is a true account of this affair as any one may see, who will consult *Baluzius*'s Life of *de Marca*, *De Marca*'s Answer to *Holstenius*, and the Roman Censure, his little Book written on this occasion, a Schedule tendered to the Romanists, and his *Letters* to *Cardinal Barbarini*, and Pope *Innocent* the Tenth, all which are printed with *De Marca*'s Book [*De Concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii.*] So that the Propositions of *De Marca* which Dr. *Sherlock* hath imperfectly Translated, as a Scheme of the French Liberties, are in Truth an Account of *De Marca*'s own Judgment as it was opposite unto, and destructive of the *Gallican* Liberties.

Edit. *Paris*, 1669.

It was, I must acknowledge, an unlucky cast of the Doctors Eye to pitch upon a passage so cross to the thing for which he designed it; for it's either as great a *mistake*, or *Misrepresentation* as it's possible for a Man of Sense to be guilty of, and whether the one or the other, it ought to be a Caution to all Readers, how they take up any thing upon trust from this Man, and I wish it may be a means to engage the Doctor himself to more modesty, and an abatement of his contemptuous way of writing (if he does write more) for the time to come.

Having then removed this Objection, it's past doubt that the *French* are only for the Primacy of St. *Peter*'s Chair, and against the Supreme Jurisdiction of the Roman Popes, and at this time the very Jesuits in *France* are tack'd about and fallen in with their Prince in asserting the Rights of the *Regalia* to belong to the French Kings. And not only the Roman Catholics in *France* are of this perswasion, but in *Germany*, *Spain*, *Portugal*, *Venice*, they are of the same mind. Those who will, may be at the pain of consulting the many Writers of several Nations on this Subject Collected by *Melchior Goldastus*: But for the sake of the Church of *England* Clergy, I will insert a few of the many passages Arch-bishop *Bramhall* has, in his [*Just Vindication* of the *Church of* England] observ'd, who tells us, 'That the first
Pag. 109. 'Council of *Pisa* did not only subtract their 'Obedience from *Peter de Luna*, calling himself '*Benedict* the 13*th*. and *Angelus de Coriario*, calling 'himself *Gregory* the 12*th*. But they Decreed, 'that

'that it was lawful for all Christians, and accordingly did Command them, to subtract their 'Obedience from them, of which Council the 'Council of *Constance* was a continuation. The 'Second Council of *Pisa* suspended *Julius* the Second from the Papacy, and Commanded all 'Christians to withdraw their Obedience from 'him. The *former* had the consent of the *Emperor*, the *latter* his Assistance and Protection, 'as appeareth both by the solemn promise of 'the Emperor's Ambassadors made in Council, and the acknowledgment of the Council it 'self. By the *Concordates* made between the Emperor and Princes of *Germany*, and *Nicholas* the 'Fifth, the Annates are in part remitted and taken away. And in the Year 1455, after the 'Death of *Nicholas* the Fifth, the *Germans* bewail'd their condition to *Frederick* the Third, 'and sought to perswade him, that he would no longer Obey the Roman Bishops, unless they 'would at least give way to the *Pragmatical* 'Sanction for the maintenance of the Liberties 'of the *German* Nation, like that of the French 'King's for the Privileges of the *Gallican* 'Church.

Platin. in life of *Pius* 2d. *Car. Molinæus in commentariis.*

'The *Spanish* King also in his Kingdom of 'Sicily both by himself and by his Delegates, 'whom he substitutes, with the same Authority 'doth judge, and punish all Ecclesiastical Crimes, 'Excommunicate, and Absolve all Ecclesiastical 'Persons, Lay-men, Monks, Clerks, Abbots, 'Bishops, Arch-bishops, yea and the Cardinals 'themselves which inhabite in *Sicily*. He suf-

'fers

'fers no Appeals, and admits no *Nuncio*'s from '*Rome*. And, whereas *Baronius* wrote bitterly 'againſt it, affirming that upon pretence of Apo-'ſtolic Authority a grievous Offence is com-'mitted againſt the Apoſtolic See, the King of '*Spain* gives order, and accordingly *Baronius* his 'Books are burnt publickly. Beſides the King of '*Spain*, when he pleaſeth, doth aſſume in his other 'Dominions the ſelf ſame Power; and in *Portu-'gal* the ſame has been done, and in *Venice* too, 'yea and in *England* ever ſince the Chriſtian Re-'ligion has been received.

None of our Princes, who were of the Roman Catholic Communion, would yield unto the Pope any more than a *Primacy*, no not *William* the Conqueror, nor *William Rufus*, nor any of their Succeſſors, unleſs Queen *Mary*; and it's declared by Act of Parliament, that her Power was as Sovereign and as ample as any of her Predeceſſors; and it's obſervable, that when *Paul* the Fourth revoked Cardinal *Pool's* Legatine Power, and deſigned one *Petas* to come Legat in his place, ſhe ſhut all the Ports of *England* againſt all Meſſengers from *Rome*, and Commanded all the Briefs and Bulls to be taken from the Bearers, and delivered unto her. All which ſufficiently ſhews, that a very great part of thoſe who are of the Roman Catholic Communion, do go no further than to yield unto the Pope a Primacy for the ſake of Catholic Union, and deny his having a Supreme Juriſdiction over the whole Church: And the Principle, theſe go on in, is, and indeed muſt be the ſame with what the

the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* have deliver'd, which, as I have ſufficiently prov'd, is the ſame with thoſe of Church of *England* Clergy, who undertake to prove the Diſſenters Schiſmatics, for ſeparating from the Church of *England*, whilſt they are bound by the Laws of Catholic Communion to hold Communion with her.

I have (you ſee) fairly ſtated their Notion, giving it for the moſt part in their own words, and have as fairly repreſented what a great part of the Roman Catholics hold, and which ſeems to be what my Lord of *Condom* and the Engliſh Roman Catholics are now for; and What unavoidably follows from the whole I have urg'd, is, that touching the Government of the Church, theſe Church of *England* Gentlemen and the Roman Catholics do moſt exactly agree, tho' for Reaſons beſt known to themſelves the Engliſh Clergy would fain conceal it.

In a word the Church of *England* Clergy ſeem to be convinc'd, that they cannot lay the charge of Schiſm on Diſſenters, unleſs they prove the Diſſenters bound to hold Communion with her, and this they cannot do, they ſee, but by making the *Catholic Church One Govern'd Society* under the conduct of *One Epiſcopacy*, and that their Laws of Catholic Communion may oblige all the Inhabitants within this Kingdom to Communicate with the Church of *England*, and ſubmit unto the Epiſcopal Government, they are neceſſitated to form their notion ſo, as to make it exactly Roman Catholic: For they ground the Combination

tion of their leſſer particular Churches on the Laws of Catholic Communion, and ſo on a Divine Inſtitution, as a mean to obtain the Peace and Unity of the Catholic Church; and aſſign ſuch a Power unto the Catholic Biſhops in their College or Council Aſſembled in matters relating to the Faith, Unity, and Reformation of Manners, in the Church, as neceſſarily leads them to a cloſure with the avowed Principles of the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* about the Authority of General Councils, and the *Primacy* of the *Roman* Chair, and ſo far juſtifie the Papers of his late *Majeſty* concerning the Authority of the Catholic Church in matters of Faith and Reformation of Manners. And therefore in theſe great points they can never defend themſelves againſt the Papiſts. All the Arguments they bring againſt Diſſenters may with more ſtrength be laid in againſt them by the Roman Catholic. For according to their Doctrin the Biſhops of *Spain*, *France*, *Italy*, and *Germany*, being Biſhops of the Catholic Church, tho' ordinarily their power is confin'd to their particular Churches, yet having an Original Right with Relation to the whole Catholic Church, are bound by the Laws of Communion to reaſſume their Original Right, and Aſſemble and Summon before them the Biſhops of the Church of *England*, who, in their Opinion are fallen into a great Schiſm, and Hereſie; in which Matters, theſe Biſhops have a Direct Authority over the Biſhops of the Church of *England*, and may proceed againſt them, and Depoſe them and Ordain others in their Room, and oblige

lige the People to withdraw from the Communion of the Depoſed Biſhops, in which caſe the Foreign Biſhops, being the Governing part, have as much Authority over the Engliſh Biſhops, as the Engliſh Biſhops have over Diſſenters in *England.*

The larger the Combination of Biſhops, the greater is their Power and Authority: And therefore if the Engliſh Biſhops have a direct Authority over the Diſſenters in *England*, ſo has this greater Combination of Biſhops over the Diſſenting Engliſh Biſhops, ; and as the Engliſh Biſhops inſiſt on their Authority in Deciſion of Controverſies, and the Diſſenter muſt ſubmit; ſo may this greater College of Biſhops urge their Authority, and the Diſſenting Engliſh Biſhops muſt ſubmit, and may not be admitted to exerciſe their own Judgment, or pretend Conſcience there, no more than the Engliſh Proteſtant Diſſenter may do it here.

It muſt be carefully obſerv'd, that by theſe Gentlemen the power is lodg'd with the College of Catholic Biſhops, and ſo long as the Church of *England* acknowledges the Biſhops of theſe Countries to be *Catholic Biſhops*, as now they do, they cannot queſtion their *Power*, *that* they muſt acknowledge; and by the Laws of Catholic Communion muſt obey a College of them, and appear before them, when ſummoned. The greateſt thing, that they can, with any pretence,

insist on, is the *justness* of their cause, of which they are no more competent Judges before this College, than the Dissenters are when before these Bishops here. Thus you see His late Majesty considered what he wrote, and that his Papers have more strength in them than can be refuted by our English Clergy, unless they abandon those very Principles, which they have taken up to prove the Dissenters Schismatics; and this they cannot do, without a Virtual Acknowledgment, That with the Severity of divers Penal Laws they have been prosecuting the Protestant Dissenter, for not closing with a Momentous Part of the Roman Catholic Religion, and for not submitting unto a *Roman Catholic Episcopacy*.

SECT.

SECT. II.

An Agreement between the Two Churches about ſome of their Impoſed Terms of Communion; Their Miniſtry, Ceremonies, *and* Image-Worſhip.

THE Church of *England*'s inſiſting on the Laws of Catholic Communion, to oblige the Diſſenter to fix with Her, can be of no force, unleſs ſhe vindicates the *Terms* of her Communion. For no Divine Law requires our communicating with That Part of the Catholic Church, which makes a compliance with the leaſt Sin neceſſary thereunto.

This then muſt be cleared up, the Innocency of what ſhe makes a neceſſary Term of Communion. But thus much the Church of *England* cannot do, but by defending ſome other parts of *Popery*; for the very things ſhe enjoyns as neceſſary to Communion, are no other than what are required by the Church of *Rome*. The Agreements may be reduced to theſe Heads: 1. The *Miniſtry*. 2. *Ceremonies*. 3. *Image-Worſhip*.

I.

The *Miniſtry*,

Unto which all are required to ſubmit, is the ſame with that of Roman Catholics, and maintain'd by the ſame Arguments.

1. Touching the *Difference* there is between a *Biſhop*, and a *Presbyter*, as amongſt the *Papiſts* ſome held, that they were of the *ſame Order*, differing only in *Degree*; and others, that they were of *diſtinct Orders:* ſo among our Clergy, there were ſome, who in King *James* I.'s days, aſſerted, that Biſhops and Presbyters were of the ſame Order, but now it's carried for their being of two diſtinct Orders. And altho' the *Romaniſts* do not ſo much ſtick to the Divine Right of the Epiſcopal Order, as to hold, that without a Violation of the Divine Law, a Presbyter cannot be entruſted with the Epiſcopal *Inſignia*, and Ordinary Juriſdiction, yet it's the avowed Doctrin of the Church of *England*, That the giving the Power of conferring Orders unto a Presbyter, is ſo contrary to the Divine Law, that it's *ipſo facto* null and void; and in purſuance of this Doctrin, ſhe *Re-ordains* all thoſe, who have had only a Presbyter's Ordination, even whil'ſt ſhe is againſt a Re-ordination: So that herein the Church of *England* exceeds the Severity of the Church of *Rome*.

Rome. For altho' ſhe nulls the Proteſtant Reform'd Miniſtry, yet it is not becauſe a Presbyter's Ordination cannot be valid, but on other accounts. For the Ordination by *Abbats Sovereign*, who are but Presbyters, is granted by them to be both Valid and Regular, they being not only exempt from the Juriſdiction of the Dioceſan, but have in themſelves Epiſcopal Authority, whereby they can Ordain, Correct, Suſpend, Excommunicate, and Abſolve.

Innumerable Inſtances of this kind we had here in *England* before *Henry* VIII. ſuppreſſed the Monaſteries, and Sacrilegiouſly alienated Church-Lands. And in the Roman Territories to this very day, nothing more common. Which practice, as it's Univerſal, ſo of great Antiquity too; for ſeveral of the *Northumbrian Biſhops* received their Ordination from the *Abbot* of *Hy*, on their firſt embracing the Chriſtian Religion: And in *Scotland* the Government of the Church by Presbyters had it's riſe with the publiſhing Chriſt's Goſpel amongſt them, which was very early, and ſo it continued for ſeveral hundred years, as is reported by the Hiſtorians of the Roman Catholic Communion.

But this thing ſticks grievouſly in the teeth of our *Engliſh* Clergy, who know that if this be once granted, the Divine Right of their Epiſcopacy, and the Arguments which are taken from

from thence to oblige the Diſſenter to fix his Communion with them, is ſhaken. Two very great Men of this Church have therefore made it their endeavor to invalidate the Authority of the *Scotch* Hiſtorians, and one of them hath found out a Biſhop in the Iſland *Hy*, and the other has diſcovered a Forgery in the Charters of Privileges given to the *Abbots Sovereign*. Whoever will conſult my Lord St. *Aſaph*'s *Hiſtorical Account of Church-Government*, Sir *George Mechenzy*'s Anſwer, and Dean *Stillingfleet*'s *pompous Reply* to Sir *George*, and his *Origines Britannicæ*, will ſee what pains the Prelate and Dean have taken to impoſe their Miſtakes on the World, and with what little colour of Reaſon. However, ſuppoſing that theſe men are wiſer than all the Learned Antiquaries and Divines of the Roman Communion, than the Judicious Biſhops and Archbiſhops of the *Engliſh* and *Scottiſh* Churches, who ſaw reaſon to give credit to theſe Hiſtorians; I will only take ſome notice of what is found in Hiſtories of uncontroulable Authority.

As to what my Lord St. *Aſaph* urges to prove a Biſhop at the Iſland *Hy*, 'tis only one line in my Lord Archbiſhop *Uſher*'s *Primordia*, where 'tis ſaid, *That the* Ulſter *Annals do make mention of a Biſhop's being in the little Iſle of* Hy. From this paſſage my Lord infers, That there was a Biſhop at *Hy*, who did ordain Presbyters, and conſecrate thoſe Biſhops who were ſent unto the

the *Northumbrians*. And it's remarkable, that this great Man, who rejects the *Scotch* Historians, tho' universally received, doth put so much stress on one word in the *Ulster Annals*, that have been unknown to most part of the World, and which he himself never saw. But be it so, that there was a Bishop at *Hy*, how doth it thence follow that he resided there as an *Ordainer*? Is there one word to that purpose mentioned by Archbishop *Usher*? The contrary out of *Bede* is most manifest, who asserts, That the Governor in Ecclesiasticals at *Hy* was a Presbyter, under whose Jurisdiction the whole Province was, to whom the very Bishops were in subjection; for which reason *Notkerus Balbulus* doth affirm, That a Presbyter was the Primate of all the *Irish* Bishops; and altho' the Learned Archbishop corrects *Notkerus* for saying that *Ireland* was the Province under *Hy*, yet he grants that the *Picts* and their Bishops were in subjection to the Presbyter, who was Abbot of *Hy*. And is it likely that this Presbyter, who had such a Power and Authority over all Bishops, would defere so very much unto 'em, as to receive Orders from them? An unprejudic'd mind cannot easily embrace it.

And as for Dean *Stillingfleet*, who looks on all the *Saxon* Charters of Privileges given to Abbies, as Monkish Forgeries, invented after *William* the Conqueror gave that *Invidious* Charter, as he calls it, to *Battel-Abby*; the contrary

trary is moſt manifeſt. If we do but ſingle out the Charters given to *Glaſtonbury*, we ſhall have reaſon enough to believe, that they were more Antient than the Conqueſt. Thus much ſome paſſages in *William Malmsbury* and the Charter of *Henry* 2*d.* ſufficiently prove. As for *Malmsbury*, he is known to be a Man well learned for that Age, in which he flouriſhed; a Curious Inquirer into Antiquity, who liv'd not long after the conqueſt, for he Dedicates his Hiſtory *de Geſtis Regum Anglorum* to *Robert* the Natural Son of *Henry* the firſt, and had great advantages to diſcover any Forgery, that could be made about a matter of this Importance, within ſo ſhort a time as the giving *Battail-Abby* the Invidious Charter, and the Age in which *Malmsbury* did write. But yet this Judicious and Faithful Hiſtorian after the utmoſt endeavour to know the Truth of things doth in his approved Hiſtory [*De Geſtis Regum Anglorum*] mention ſeveral Charters given to *Glaſtonbury* by the Saxon Kings, in which their Privileges and Exemptions were as great as thoſe with which *Battail-Abby* was enriched by the Conqueror, which *Malmsbury* would not have done had there been any ground to ſuſpect a Forgery.

Beſides, *Henry* the 2*d.* who was but Grandſon to *Henry* the firſt, Orders the making an impartial ſearch into *Glaſtonbury Charters*, and on the ſtricteſt Examination finds 'em very Antient,

tient, even long before the Conqueſt, and as ſuch confirms them by his *Inſpeximus*: So that we muſt ſuppoſe thoſe that were by his Majeſty Commanded to examin theſe Charters to be either very ignorant and unable to diſcover the Forgery, or very impudent in daring to impoſe ſo groſs a cheat upon their Prince, and all the Biſhops aſleep or unconcerned for their Order, that no one of them ſhould acquaint the King with it. I deny not but there may be an Addition of ſome Monkiſh Garniture in theſe Charters to gain the greater Veneration from the common People, but that the forging whole Charters, wherein great Privileges were granted, and a mighty encroachment made on the Epiſcopal Juriſdiction, pretending ſo much Antiquity, even when they could not but abound with Characters of their being but of yeſterday, and no one able, or willing to unveil the Villany, is a thing very hard to be credited by any but the Deans Diſciples.

Thus you ſee how vehemently theſe two great Men ſtrive to appropriate all Valid Ordinations to the Epiſcopal Impoſition of Hands; whereby they outdo the Roman Catholic in the ſeverity of the Cenſure they paſs on the Ordinations made by Presbyters, and joyn with them in Unchurching all Proteſtants but themſelves, as their mouth Mr. *Dodwel*, who ſpeaks out, aſſures us, when he affirms, that for want of an Epiſcopal Ordination the Reformed Churches abroad have no

Miniſtry, no Sacrament, no Church, they are out of the Covenant of Grace and hopes of Salvation.

And Dr. *Sherlock*, who cannot ſee the tendency of his own Principles, as they Damn all Proteſtants, yet is bold in acknowledging that he unchurches all the Engliſh Diſſenters, excluding them likewiſe all hopes of Salvation.

2. They agree alſo in aſſerting the Difference between a *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, to be of an *Immediate Divine Right*. It's true, that thoſe, who are for the Divine Right of the Supreme Jurisdiction of the Pope, over the whole Catholic Church Viſible, do hold the Divine Right of Biſhops to be but mediate [*mediante Papâ*;] but the followers of the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* are againſt the Supreme Uncontroulable Juriſdiction of the Pope, and for the *immediate Divine Right of Epiſcopacy*. And it's notorious from the Debates in the Council of *Trent*, that the *French*, *Spaniſh*, and many other *Roman* Catholics ſtuck to their *immediate Divine Right* too, and the great Reaſon, why oppoſition was made by the Court of *Rome* againſt the immediate Divine Right of Biſhops, was an opinion, that the Supremacy of the Pope could not be ſecured on the granting it. But Dr. *Sherlock* has found out a Notion, which will be of great uſe to 'em. For the Divine Right of a Primacy is a great ſtep to the Supremacy, and this

this the Doctor doth eſtabliſh conſiſtently enough with the immediate Divine Right of Biſhops.

What is founded on the Laws of Catholic Communion (ſaith he) is a Divine Inſtitution, and the larger Combinations of Churches, and a Primate for the preſerving the Peace and Unity of the Catholic Church, is grounded on the Laws of Catholic Communion, and therefore on a Divine Inſtitution. This I confeſs the Doctor doth not *expreſly* carry any further than the Combinations of a National Church and Primacy. And yet from his grounding this Combination on the Laws of Catholic Communion, it naturally follows, that ſeeing the greater the Combination, the better is Catholic Communion preſerv'd, the largeſt Combination is by the Laws of Catholic Communion moſt ſtrictly required, and more ſpecially grounded on a Divine Inſtitution. Now the largeſt Combination is what the Roman Catholic is for, and if that, according to this Doctor, be ſupported by a Divine Inſtitution a Primacy of one over this great combined Church being for the ſecuring the Peace of the Church Catholic, muſt be alſo grounded on the Laws of Catholic Communion, and therefore on a Divine Inſtitution.

Thus you ſee that our Engliſh Clergy-man hath found out a Divine Inſtitution for the

Popes *Primacy*, conſiſtent with the Immediate Divine Right of Epiſcopacy: And his adding, that the Exerciſe of this Primates power, muſt be under the Regulation of Eccleſiaſtical Canons, doth not contradict it; for the Exerciſe of every Biſhops power is to be regulated by Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions, whoſe power, according unto him, muſt ſtill be affirm'd to be of an immediate Divine Right.

Nec etiam veriti ſunt viri in omni diſciplinarum genere celebres, ac in Chriſtianæ Theologiæ ſtudiis illuſtres, in magno hominum conventu, aſſerere, hoc jus Pontificis humanum eſſe. De poteſt. Pontif.

But if the Doctor will have it, that his Primate is but an Human Creature, I muſt add, that there are Papiſts of the ſame mind too: for, as Cardinal *Contarene* obſerves, many Learned Men, and Eminent Divines affirm the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff to be but Human.

In a word, the Agreement between the Engliſh Clergy and the Romaniſt, about the immediate Divine Right of Epiſcopacy, is ſo full, and Authorities to confirm it, ſo many, that an enumerating 'em would be endleſs, and in a caſe ſo plain, unneceſſary. I will therefore be yet more particular in ſhewing,

3. The Agreement there is between 'em about the *Hierarchy*, which is made up of Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Deans, Prebends, Canons, Arch-deacons, Chancellors, Officials, Com-

Commiſſioners, Prieſts, Deacons, *&c.*

The talk of a Proteſtant Hierarchy, as if it formally differed from the Roman, even when both are ſetled on a Divine Right, is *Ludicrous*, and trifling. That the Men in Office are of Different Opinions in Religion, is of extrinſic conſideration to the Hierarchy, and can make no alteration in it; nor can a Difference between ſome Laws obſerv'd by the Men in Office be ſufficient to make the Hierarchies of a different kind.

If the Order and the Offices in each Hierarchy be the ſame, the Hierarchy is the ſame. And that there are the ſame Offices in both, is manifeſt; there is no difference between a *French*, *Spaniſh*, or *Engliſh* Dean, Arch-deacon, Biſhop; and as their Offices are the ſame, ſo is the Order that is among them. By *Order* I do not mean what the Roman Catholics do when they talk of ſeven Orders; but ſeeing there is a Government amongſt the Clergy, and thoſe other Officers, as Chancellors, *&c.* who make up the Hierarchy, there muſt be an Order amongſt them, which is *ſecundum ſub, & ſupra.* A Superior Governing and an Inferior Governed part. The Hierarchy muſt, I ſay, be conſidered as a Body entire within it ſelf as well as the Governing part of a larger Body Politic. There is, as *Duarenus* obſerves, *Diſciplina Cleri* as well as *Diſciplina Populi.* And in this

this Senſe the Order is in both Hierarchies the ſame. The Subordination of Officers the ſame, and in both we may go up from the Deacon by ſteps to the Arch-biſhop and Primate.

Compare the National Church of *England* with the *French*, or *Spaniſh* National Churches and the Order is the ſame in all. The *Cauſes* alſo which belong unto their Juriſdiction are in both the ſame, *viz.* Cauſes Teſtamentary and Matrimonial, *&c.* Beſides, the *Laws*, by which they exerciſe their Power, in both for the moſt part the ſame. For in *England* the Canons of General Council's and Holy Fathers, and the Decrees of the Popes of *Rome*, ſo far as they were received in *Henry 8ths.* time, who was a Roman Catholic, and that is ſo far as they have been received within this Kingdom by Permiſſion of our Kings, and as the People by a dayly Uſe have obliged themſelves unto 'em. The Conſtitutions which have been antiently ordain'd by the Popes Legates *Otho*, and *Othobon*, on which *John de Athon* has written his Annotations, and by the Arch-biſhops of *Canterbury* (who liv'd and died in the Roman Communion,) and collected by *William Lindwood*, ſo far as they are not contrary to the King's Prerogative, and the Cuſtoms, and Statutes of this Realm, and all proceedings in Eccleſiaſtical Courts by theſe Laws the ſame. And the Power of the Higheſt Courts in *France*, *Sicily*, and

Vide Zouch. deſcrip. jur. Eccleſ. par. 1. Sect. 1.

and *England*, equally entire within it ſelf, and no further dependent on St. *Peter*'s Chair, than is juſtifiable by the *Engliſh* Clergy-man's Divinity, who agree likewiſe in derivation of the Miniſterial Authority by Ordination, both from the ſame Sourſe.

II.

The *Ceremonies*, or *External Worſhip*,

Unto which all are required to conform, are in the Engliſh Church of the ſame kind with thoſe in the Roman Catholic Communion. I will be but ſhort in ſtating this matter.

The firſt Reformers of the Church of *England* did, it muſt be confeſſed, agree with the *Nonconformiſts*, and differed from the Papiſts. And the Argument which the Church of *England* Divines, and the Diſſenter alſo, urg'd againſt the Ceremonious Worſhip of the Church of *Rome*, was this:

All uninſtituted Worſhip, is Falſe, Superſtitious, and Idolatrous Worſhip.

But the Romiſh Ceremonious Worſhip is uninſtituted. Ergo.

The

The Papists grant, that their Ceremonies in Controversie, are Acts of External Worship, and were very sensible that there was no express Institution in the written Word of God, enjoyning their Observance. They made it therefore their business to oppose the *Major*, which they did by distinguishing between one sort of External Worship and another; for they said that *External Worship* might be considered either as *Primary*, or *Secondary*; as *Essential*, or *Accidental*; as *Proper*, or *Improper*; and affirmed, that all *Primary*, *Essential* and *Proper* Worship must be according to the Revealed Will of God, or else 'twas sinful and superstitious, yet not Idolatrous, so long as it did ultimately terminate on the True God. But as for that which was Worship *Secundarily*, *Accidentally*, or *Improperly* only, tho' not instituted, yet 'twas lawful, as they endeavor to prove by giving several Instances of uninstituted Secondary Worship, which is lawful; as, uncommanded Vows, Free-will Offerings, the keeping the Memorials of God's Works, sometimes by *pitching Stones*, *setting up Pillars*, by *Set-days*, as *the Feasts of Purim*, and sometimes by *the laying up the Ensigns*, as *Goliah's Sword*.

Vide Bellarm. *de effect. Sacram. l. 2. c.* 31, 32. *& de Imag. l. 2. c.* 13. Filiuc. *Moral. Quæst. c. 1. n. 9.* Greg. *de Valent. disp. 6. quæst. 9. punct. 1 & quæst. 1. punct 7. de Oratione.* Bellarm. *de* Roman. *Pontif. l. 4. c.* 17.

Furthermore, *Secondly*, they distinguish between *Corrupting* and *Perfective Additions*, confessing, That all Corrupting Additions to the Word of God are forbidden; but then the Additions

ditions in controverſie are not Corrupting. And they add, *Thirdly*, That tho' they fall not under a *Particular*, yet they fall under a *General* Allowance; *Let all things be done decently, and in order*; and, *Be ye ſubject to the Higher Powers*; *Submit your ſelves to them that have the Rule over you*; whereby they are obliged to the Obſervance of thoſe things that are not apparently contrary to the Word of God. Papiſt Miſrepreſ. & Repr. Sect. 36.

But our old Reformers rejected all theſe Diſtinctions as Unſcriptural, and conſequently inſufficient to their purpoſe; affirming, That God alone was the Author of Acceptable Worſhip; and that what was not commanded in the written Word of God was forbidden by the Second Commandment. But this gave occaſion to the Controverſie between the Church of *England* and the Proteſtant Diſſenter. For the Diſſenters were of Opinion, That the retained Ceremonies were as much parts of External Worſhip, as the rejected Ceremonies. For which reaſon the Diſſenters uſed the ſame *Medium* againſt the Church of *England*, which the Church of *England* uſed againſt the Roman Catholic; and formed their Argument thus:

All uninſtituted Worſhip is Falſe, Superſtitious, and Idolatrous Worſhip.

But the Engliſh *Ceremonies are a part of Worſhip, and Uninſtituted.* Ergo.

To this Argument they in the first place answered by denying the *Minor*. And the Dissenter made it his endeavor to prove, That the controverted Ceremonies were parts of External Worship, which at last they did with success, to the conviction of the Church of *England* Clergy, who found themselves necessitated to grant the *Minor*, and to fall in with the Roman Catholic, in denying the *Major*, and to that end made use of the same Distinctions and Answers which the Roman Catholics did; yea, they at length grew bold, and gave the same Definition of a Ceremony which the Church of *Rome* did.

Modest and Reason. Examin. *c.* 6.

Thus Doctor *Covel*, a great Asserter of the English Ceremonies, gives us the sense of the Church of *England*, in Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s own words, as near as an English Translation can well be to a Latin Original. *Bellarmin* defines a Ceremony thus: *Ceremonia est actus externus Religionis, qui non aliundè habet laudem, nisi quia fit ad Dei honorem*; which is exactly translated by *Covel*, who makes no mention of *Bellarmine*, when in his Controversie with Dissenters he defines Ceremonies thus: *Ceremonies are all such things as are the External Acts of Religion, which have their Commendation and Allowance from no other Cause, but only that in God's Worship they are Vertuous Furtherances of his Honor.* More particularly, A Ce-

Bellarm. de effect. Sacram.

remony

remony is, ſaith *Bellarmin*, *Actus externus interno reſpondens, quæ non aliunde eſt bona, niſi quia ſit ad Deum colendum*: Or as *Covel*, a Ceremony is an external Act anſwering the Internal, which is no otherwiſe good and commendable than that it vertuouſly ſerveth to the inward Worſhip of God. It is an Outward Expreſſion of Inward Worſhip. Yea, Secondly, it is a *Vertuous Furtherance* of Inward Religion, which is for the Honor of God. It is apt to ſtir up the mind of Man to the Remembrance of his Duty unto God, by ſome notable and ſpecial ſignification whereby he might be Edified: they are apt to *inform* us and *put us in mind* of our Duty, and to *excite* us to perform it; and as it is in one of the *Prefaces* before our Book of Common Prayer, Ceremonies are by ſome notable ſignification deſigned to ſtir up the dull minds of Men to the Remembrance of their Duty.

See the Anſwer to *Melius Inquirendum.*

Thus you ſee that there is an Agreement between the two Churches about the Nature of a Ceremony, which is by both Churches made a part of External Worſhip, it's no wonder therefore, if they uſe the ſame *Media* to defend them as indeed they do; Whoever will compare Doctor *Morton*, and *Burgeſs* with the Roman Catholic writers, may with much clearneſs ſee the Truth of this. Or let us but conſult the Papiſt *Miſrepreſented*, and *Repreſent-* Pag. 105.

ed, and we ſhall meet with ſuch paſſages as theſe, 'The Church determins ſeveral Rites and 'Ceremonies to be obſerved, for more Decency, 'greater Solemnity, and that by ſuch Exterior 'helps, the minds of the Faithful may be mov'd 'to the Contemplation of the Sacred Myſteries, 'and rais'd more ſenſibly to the Apprehenſion 'of the Majeſty of God, in whoſe honor all 'is perform'd; They look upon themſelves 'bound to allow and embrace all theſe things 'without Reluctancy or Oppoſition, always 'thinking that to be moſt proper, which is 'inſtituted by ſuch who have the Rule over 'them. Here you may ſee the deſign and intendment of the Popiſh Ceremonies, and the Reaſon of the Peoples Compliance with them. And what doth the Church of *England* Anſwerer ſay to all this? It is in theſe words, 'His Diſcourſe on this head is againſt thoſe who 'refuſe to obey their Superiors in things, not ex-'preſs in Scripture, which is no part of our Con-'troverſie with them. And then adds, 'But yet 'there are ſeveral things about their Ceremo-'nies we are not ſatisfied in. As 1. The 'mighty Number of them. But according to his former conceſſion, are not the Governors of the Church empowered to command what is not expreſſed in Scripture, and are not they the proper Judges? 2. *The Efficacy Attributed to them without any Promiſe from God, whereas we own no more but Decency, and Significancy.* But I Anſwer, 1. You own that they are for the

Stirring

Stirring up our *Dull* minds, and ſo far there is efficacy Attributed to them. 2. The Papiſts (if we may believe *Bellarmin*) do not Attribute the ſame Efficacy unto their *Ceremonies*, which they do to their *Sacraments*, That they only aſſert againſt the Heretics, 'that it is lawful for the 'Church, to inſtitute new Ceremonies, not 'for Juſtification, but for other ends. And if they hold the Doctrins which are diſtinct from this, it's not to the purpoſe, it being manifeſt, that ſo far you agree with the Romaniſts. Now thoſe, who ravel into the Controverſie about *Image Worſhip*, as manag'd by the Papiſts, will find ſome of that Communion to make their Images nothing more than ſignificant Ceremonies, for the exciting and ſtirring up their dull minds to the Remembrance of their Duty and to the Worſhiping God with the greater Reverence and Affection. There are, I muſt confeſs, different Apprehenſions among the Roman Catholics about the uſe of Images in their Churches. *Durandus*, *Holcot*, and *Mirandula* are by ſome judg'd to agree in their Oppoſitions againſt the *Thomiſts*, and yet by others are ſuppoſed to differ among themſelves about *Image Worſhip*. *Gregory de Valentia* aſſures us, that *Picus Mirandula*, *Pereſius de Aiala*, and *Catharinus* deny Images to be Worſhiped with the Reverence that is due to the Prototype, as terminating objects. And that *Durandus*, with whom *Alphonſus à Caſtro* agrees, holds that the Images of God and Chriſt are not

Bellarm. *de effect. Sacram.* lib. 2. c. 29.

not to be worſhiped with *Latria* in a *proper* ſenſe, but *improperly*; which diſtinction, according to *Bellarmine*'s Explanation, doth make *Durandus*'s way to be much the ſame with what many of the *Thomiſts* eſpouſe, when they ſay that *Latria* is to be given to the Image, not properly, as unto God, but improperly, as unto the Repreſentation of God. *Azorius* brings in *Alexander*, *Holcot*, *Durandus*, and *Mirandula*, as agreed. But notwithſtanding the many different Opinions there are about theſe things, when I read the Reaſonings of *Holcot* and *Mirandula*, I am induc'd to believe that they are againſt the rendring *Latria*, or Divine Worſhip, to the Images of God and Chriſt, in any ſenſe.

Ferrarienſis, a great *Thomiſt*, gives us the Arguments of theſe two Great Men, which he anſwers, and they are theſe: *Holcot* ſaith, That the Image of Chriſt is not to be worſhiped with *Latria*, becauſe *Latria* belongs to God alone; but no Image is God: And whoſoever *thus* worſhips any thing beſides God, doth thereby confeſs, That he makes ſomewhat beſides God to be God. For to worſhip any thing with *Latria*, is to make *That* a God.

Mirandula argues thus: The Image, as ſuch, is diſtinct from its Exemplar; and therefore if, as *ſuch*, it terminates the Worſhip of *Latria*, it unavoidably follows, That ſomewhat

what beſides God is worſhiped with *Latria*. Again, ſaith he, If the Image and the Prototype make up One Total Object of Worſhip, either the very Image, which is *Ens creatum reſpectivum*, is one part of this Total Object, or not: If the former, then ſome Created Being, which belongs to the Predicament of Relation, doth, at leaſt partially, terminate the Worſhip of *Latria*, which ſeems to be contrary to the Catholic Faith: If the later, it cannot be ſaid, That the One Total Object of *Latria* is made up of the Image and the Exemplar. Theſe Arguments do fully convince me, That they are againſt the worſhiping the Image of God and Chriſt with *Latria*, either *Properly*, or *Improperly*; either *per ſe*, or *per accidens*; *propter ſe*, or *propter aliud*. And that the only Uſe they made of theſe Images was to raiſe their minds towards Heaven, to the end they might there honor Chriſt. So that Images are to them of the ſame Uſe that *Tapers* and *Incenſe* are; the firſt to repreſent our Saviour, who came to enlighten the world; the other to mind the People, that their Hearts and Prayers ſhould, like the Smoke, aſcend directly to Heaven; and in like manner, the Images of Chriſt to be memorative Signs, ſtirring up their dull minds to worſhip him. And ſo ſeem, with the *Lutherans*, to make their Images but ſuch ſignificant Ceremonies as are enjoyned by the Church of *England*.

See Papiſt Miſrepreſ. & Repr. p. 105.

III. The

III.

The Agreement about *Image-Worſhip.*

Anſwer to a Papiſt proteſting againſt Proteſtant Popery, *p.*81.

We are told by a Church of *England* Divine, in his late Diſpute with the Author of the *Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented,* 'That 'to pay the External Acts of Adoration TO, 'or BEFORE, or IN PRESENCE of 'a Repreſentative Object, *as* repreſenting, is 'the very ſame thing, it is all one kind of Wor-'ſhip, becauſe the Formal Reaſon is the ſame 'in both, and that is the *Repreſentation*: When 'I bow TO the Image of Chriſt, I bow TO 'it as repreſenting Chriſt to me, who is the 'ultimate Object of my Worſhip: When I 'bow BEFORE, or *in the* PRESENCE 'of the Image, I do the ſame thing, tho' I 'give it a *new Name.* I bow *before* it, as repre-'ſenting Chriſt to me, as if he himſelf were 'there perſonally preſent in the Image: When 'I bow to the Image, I do not bow to the Wood or 'Stone, but to Chriſt as repreſented in the Image. 'When I BOW *to Chriſt before the Image,* I do 'the ſame thing. Thus you ſee, that to bow to Chriſt *before the Image,* is the ſame with bowing TO the Image, according to this Gentleman's Doctrin. But what follows from all this? Nothing leſs than that the Church of *England* Clergy *do bow,* and give Religious Worſhip TO

a

a Creature, TO Bread. For it's well known, that those who oppose the Doctrin of *Transubstantiation*, do vehemently affirm, That the Substance of the Bread is the *Image* of Christ's Body; that it's not only a *Memorative*, but a *Representing Sign*; and that Christ is there *Really*, tho' not *Corporally* present. And, as another Doctor of the Church of *England* observes, 'The Doctrin of 'the *Corporal presence of Christ* was started upon 'occasion of the Dispute about the *Worship of Ima-'ges*, in opposition whereto the Synod of *Con-'stantinople*, about the year of Christ DCCL, 'did argue thus, That our Lord having left us 'no other Image of himself but the Sacrament, in 'which the Substance of Bread is the *Image* of his 'Body, we ought to make no other Image of our 'Lord. In answer to this Argument, the second 'Council of *Nice*, in the year DCCLXXXVII, 'did declare, That the Sacrament after Conse-'cration is not the Image and Antitype of Christ's 'Body and Blood, but is properly his Body and 'Blood. So far the Doctor. To this let us add, That the Church of *England* has enjoyned *Bowing* or *Kneeling* at the reception of the Lord's Supper, *for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for avoiding such* Profanation *and* Disorder *in the holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue.* So that Kneeling is expressive of the Inward Reverence of the heart to Christ, and so is an Act of Religious Adoration. The Kneeling then BEFORE the Sacramental

Discourse against *Transub.* p. 21.

Signs, is the ſame with kneeling TO them. Bowing before them is the ſame with bowing UNTO them. A worſhiping before them, the ſame with giving a Religious Worſhip to them; which ſufficiently ſhews, That in One Great Inſtance the Church of *England* retains the ſame *kind* of *Image-worſhip* with the Roman Catholics, and ſo far are agreed with them.

And whereas the Defender of the Church of *England* againſt the Papiſt tells us, That no man kneels TO the Sacrament, but only receives the Sacrament kneeling; it's manifeſt, 1. That the Sacrament is an Image of Chriſt, and that Chriſt is really preſent there. 2. That they do kneel *before*, or *in preſence* of the Sacrament, conſidering it as a Sacrament in *Actu exercito*, and that is, *as repreſenting*; and if, as this Gentleman will have it, to worſhip Chriſt *before*, or *in preſence* of his Image, be the ſame
Page 84. with giving worſhip unto it, they do kneel to the Sacrament, and worſhip it. Ay, but *if the Author of the Papiſt miſrepreſented*, &c. *cannot diſtinguiſh between an act of Worſhip* to *the Sacrament, & a devout poſture of receiving it, yet the meaneſt Son of the Church of* England *can*. Anſwer, No doubt but the meaneſt Sons of the Church of *England* are hugely Learned, and can ſee further into a Myſtery, than either a dull Papiſt or Proteſtant Diſſenter can. But good Dr. remember your own Doctrin, and then tell us, whether Kneeling be not an Act of Worſhip. Is it not to expreſs

preſs humble thanks for Chriſt's benefits and to avoid Prophanation? And can it be expreſſive of all this, and yet be no act of Worſhip? You tell us, that bowing before other Images is an Act of Worſhip, and how comes it to be leſs ſo when before this Image? What is it that makes a Papiſt's Kneeling before an Image more an Act of Worſhip than the Kneeling of a Son of your Church, and why may not the Papiſt as well ſay he Kneels not to the Image; That he Prays only to God before it *kneeling*; as you ſay, that you Kneel not to the Sacrament but only receive it Kneeling? But he goes on, *why does he not as well ſay that when we Kneel at Prayer, we Worſhip the Common-Prayer-Book, which lies before us, and out of which we Read, as that we Worſhip the Bread, when we Receive, and Eat it with Devout Paſſions upon our Knees?* This Gentleman ſure doth think this to be a knotty Queſtion, and not Anſwerable, for he ſeems to urge it with ſome Triumph; but, if he would conſider, that the *Common-Prayer-Book* is no Sacrament, no Repreſenting Sign, no Image, and *that* the Bread before which he Kneels is, there would be no great difficulty in his Queſtion. The one is a Kneeling before an Image, and ſo is not the other.

I might be very large in the Proſecution of this Point, but it's not neceſſary. Enough has been ſaid to ſhew the *Agreement* there is between the Church of *England* Clergy and the

Roman *Catholic* about their Miniſtry, the Nature of Ceremonies, the Arguments for them, the Reaſons why Diſſenters ought to ſubmit unto them, and about Image-worſhip. I will therefore only add what a great Biſhop of the Church of *England* reports concerning the Prayers of the Church of *England* and it's this, 'There is nothing in our Prayers, but what hath 'been approv'd by the Popes themſelves, and 'taken out of the Liturgies of the moſt holy Fa- 'thers, which is ſo very true, that ſome of the 'Popes would have approved of that Form of 'Holy Offices which we uſe, would we but 'acknowledg his Authority.

Nam ut à precibus noſtris ordiamur, quid tandem in illis occurrit quod non ſit ab ipſis Pontificiis probatum, & ex ſanctiſſimorum patrum Liturgiis petitum? Quod uſque adeo verum eſt, ut quidam ex ipſis Pontificibus Romanis Formulam illam Sacrorum officiorum, quâ nos utimur, probare voluerit, modò nos ex ejus Authoritate hâc in re pendere voluiſſemus. Davenant. determ. 27.

The truth of this Agreement between the two Churches has been ſo very obvious to ſome great Men of the Roman Communion, that they have applauded thoſe of the Engliſh Clergy, who wrote againſt Diſſenters, as excellent Defenders of the Catholic Cauſe. *William Reynolds* the Jeſuite affirms, that *Arch-biſhop Whitgift* againſt *Cartwright* has defended the Catholic Cauſe, and in his Writings againſt *Whitaker* makes great uſe of *Whitgifts* Book. *Scultingius*, and *Stapleton* give the ſame Character both of the Writings of *Whitgift*, and his Succeſſor *Bancroft* againſt the Puritans; and *Gretzer* Triumph's in *Saravia*'s, and *Sutclifs* defence

fence of the Episcopal Authority. And *Hooker* for the Service he did the Church of *Rome*, in his Writings for the Worship, and Discipline of the Church of *England* has had the praises of the Romanists, as Mr. *Walton* in his life has observ'd; which was no more than what Dr. *King*, sometime Bishop of *Chichester*, was acquainted with, as he expresses it in a Letter to Mr. *Walton*, 'I am glad, saith the 'Bishop, that you mention how much value *Robert Stapleton*, 'Pope *Clement* the 8*th*. and other Eminent Men of the Ro-'mish Communion have put on this Book, having been 'told the same in my Youth by Persons of worth, that have 'travell'd *Italy*.

The Necessity of an Agreement between the Church of England *and the Church of* Rome, *evinced from the Nature and Constitution of a National Church Episcopally Established.*

TO shew the necessity of an Agreement between the Church of *England* (as now Established, according to your present and avowed Constitution) with the Church of *Rome*, I shall only discuss the following Question.

Whether the asserting of the *Subordination of Pastors in the Church*, doth not by all good consequence necessarily infer the *Supremacy* of an Oecumenic or Universal Pastor.

To explain a little the Terms of the Question; 1. *Church*

is

is a word that the men of our Age are moſt egregiouſly cheated in, it's needful therefore to ſpeak a little to it: The proper ſignification of *Church* is a Congregation or Aſſembly, and all that know the uſage of the word ἐκκλησία, both in Claſſic Authors, and in the New Teſtament, can't with any fairneſs deny it. It's not my Province now to enlarge here, but to proceed to the matter in hand, and ſpeak to this point, according to the Sentiments and Profeſſion of our Proteſtant Prelates and their Followers. And accordingly we muſt diſtinguiſh between *a Church* and *the Church*; *a Church* is any particular Church, as the Church of *England*, or of *France*, or *Spain*; a *National*, *Dioceſan*, or *Provincial Church*: But when we ſpeak of *the Church*, we mean *Emphaticè*, and καθ' ἐξοχὴν, the moſt large, eminent, and comprehenſive Church, and hence it belongs to the *Catholic* Church only. And therefore men are moſt groſly impoſed upon by an *Amphibology*, when they are frighted into Conformity & Subjection to the Impoſitions of any particular Church, upon ſuppoſition that the Laws and Conſtitutions of this or that particular Church, *viz.* of *England* or *France*, *&c.* (however they differ from, or are contrary to the Catholic Laws and Conſtitutions) are the Laws, Conſtitutions, and Eſtabliſhments of *the Church*, *i. e.* the *Catholic Church*, as the people do for the moſt part believe, when they are but the Laws and Canons of one *particular*, and it may be *independent* Church. How this blind Obedience hath of late prevailed, is not unknown to the moſt conſiderate Obſervators, That when any National Church will rend it ſelf from the Catholic, and ſet up independently for it ſelf, it preſently aſſumes a Papal and Legiſlative Power unto it ſelf, enforcing all that it commands upon the people with this Sham, *The Church commands and requires it.* It's manifeſt how many poor ignorant Creatures have been *bugbear'd* out of their Conſciences and Religion,

Manhood

Manhood and Wits, of late years by this *Scare-crow*; and others, with a little addition of Penal Laws, robb'd of their Liberties, Estates, and Lives; and it's becauſe they will not obey *the Church*: And when all comes to all (things being duly weighed) they are but the Uſurping Magiſterial Dictates of *a Church*, National, Provincial, or Dioceſan; of ſome *Hermophroditic* Church or other, partly Papiſt, and partly Proteſtant.

The *Catholic Church*, in all true logical acceptation of words, is *the Church*, according to the old and true Rule, *Equivocum per ſe poſitum, ſtat pro famoſiori ſignificato*; the Emphaſis always putting the Equivocal word upon the moſt Noble, Largeſt, and Generical Signification: For, unleſs this be mens meaning when they found their Mandates on *the Church*, their Bow is too weak to ſend home the Arrow to the Mark; for the Mandates of a particular Church reach but thoſe who voluntarily become her Members, by cohabitation (according to ſome) and voluntary profeſſed Subjection, according to others; whereas the Commands and Injunctions (if ſuch may be had) of the *Catholic Church*, reach and extend themſelves to all Chriſtians whatever, in all parts of the World, being every one individual Members of that Church. Beſides, tho' particular Churches are to be obeyed in their *Subordinate* place and kind, yet no one of them are to be obeyed as *the Church*, the Supreme Governing Church, but as *a Church* only, a particular, ſubordinate, and dependent Church; but when they become *independent*, and broke off from their due Subordination and Concatenation to the *Catholic*, they are to be look'd upon (according to the true Principles of Proteſtant Biſhops) to be *Heterogeneous*, *Independent*, and *Schiſmatical*.

2. By Subordination of Paſtors we underſtand the Standing of ſeveral men in diſtinct Orders, or Degrees of Office, one

one above another, or under another, in Subordinate Ranks: the Terms of which Subordination is *Supremus & Infimus*: All the differences in the World about Churches and Paſtors may be referred to two ſorts of men; They that contend for *Subordination* of Churches and Paſtors, are one ſort; and the other ſuch as contend for *Co-ordination* of Churches and Paſtors. All Perſuaſions agree in this, that the Catholic Church is made up of particular Churches; but men differ in the manner of their *Concatenation* into one Body: One ſort ſaith, That it is by *Co-ordinate Union* in one Spirit, Faith, Baptiſm, under Chriſt their Inviſible Head; the other Party do ſay, or are bound to ſay, (as will more clearly appear afterward) That particular Churches and Paſtors are *concatenated* into a Catholic Viſible Body by Subordination of one to another, from a *Maximum* or *Supremum quod ſic* to a *minimum quod ſic*, *& Vice verſâ*. The Church of *Rome* and *England* do unanimouſly agree in this, *viz.* That the Supreme, moſt Comprehenſive, Viſible Church, is capable of an adequate Paſtor, next under Chriſt Supreme to all other Paſtors, ſubjected Subordinately, and doth enfold and enwrap all other Viſible Churches on Earth in the rank of Subordination. *e. g.* The *Catholic* enfolds, and is nextly conſtituted and made up of *Patriarchates*; *Patriarchates* enfold, and are nextly conſtituted or made up of *National* Churches; ſo *National* of *Provincial*, *Provincial* of *Dioceſan*, *&c.* The Roman Catholics ſay (and that upon juſt reaſon, according to the Hypotheſis) that by the Rules in Subordination of Churches and Paſtors, the Degrees in the aſcending part ought no where to ſtop, till we arrive at the moſt Catholic Viſible Church and Paſtor in the World. The Proteſtant Prelates and Doctors, (who go not Dr. *Sherlock*'s way) do ſay, That there are no Degrees of Subordination in the aſcending part, above a National Church and Paſtor; and break off Schiſmatically

matically from *Catholic Communion* by violating the Laws, and limits of ſubordination to the Catholic Church, and hereby whatever they may pretend and however prevaricate with the People, it's moſt manifeſt they aſſume to themſelves a *Papal Juriſdiction*, and in it's proper Nature no better than what they condemn the Papiſt for: They condemn the Papiſts for ſetting up a *Catholic Supreme Paſtor*, they erect a *National Supreme Paſtor*, both Churches aſſerting *Infallibility* in their way, the Church of *Rome* more plainly and directly, the Proteſtant National Churches by inevitable conſequence; for all Churches that puniſh others for not owning and ſubmitting to their Dictates and Mandates, do thereby declare their own *Infallibility* therein, for it's the moſt unjuſt and unreaſonable thing in the World for me to pretend to force another to believe and practiſe that which I am not aſſured to be truth, and which he may, and ought not to take upon my credit to be ſo.

3. By an *Oecumenic Paſtor*, we mean the univerſal viſible ruling Head of the *Catholic organized Church militant*, in which all the Lines of Subordination meet; and however they may divide themſelves in the deſcending part on ſeveral Points of Individuation in particular Churches; yet they muſt be ſuppoſed all to meet and concentrate in the *Catholic Headſhip*: Having thus plainly Explicated the Terms of the Queſtion propounded, I come to the Determination and aſſert it in the *Affirmative*, which ſhall be confirmed, with the enſuing Arguments, taken from the Principles of the *Church of England*'s *Clergy*, for ſuch is the conſtitution of that Church, Dr. *Sherlocks* Arguments do naturally flow from it.

Arg. 1. There is the ſame *Politic Reaſon* for an univerſal Paſtor that there is for any Subordinate Paſtor that hath Paſtors ſubjected unto him; as to inſtance in a *Pro-*

vincial Paſtor ruling his Dioceſan Biſhops, the chief Politic Reaſon of the Provincials Power is, *Juriſdiction, Determination of Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes, Regulation of Abuſes, Conſecration of Biſhops, Unity, Order and Uniformity among his Clergy and Laity*, &c. By the ſame Politic Reaſon, tho in a *higher Sphere* of Eccleſiaſtical Government, is a *Primate or Metropolitan* requiſite to preſide over all the National Church, conſiſting next of Provincials, they of Dioceſes made up of Pariſhes, for the uniting all in one *common National Head*, for the maintaining a National Uniformity, and for the extermination (as the *ultimum refugium*) of all Faction and Schiſm out of the whole Church. To rule next and more immediately over the *Provincials*, to bind them together as *principium unitatis nationalis*, and thereby naturally to produce a National Order and uniformity; yea more remote and influentially, to diſpoſe and manage all other ſubordinate Biſhops and Prieſts in the ſaid Church to the good Ends and Purpoſes mentioned in order to the common good. Hence proceeds that harmonious Agreement of all the Clergy, and comly Concatenation of all Eccleſiaſtical limits, from the higheſt to the loweſt, yea to him therefore and his *High Commiſſion Courts*, all Appeals from Dioceſan and Provincial Courts are to be made (*jure conſtitutionis*) for the Determination of all Cauſes of greater weight ſo far as is conſiſtent with his *Sphere* of Government.

Subordination of Paſtors thus far allowed, granted and practiſed by our Proteſtant Prelates; *A Patriach* for uniting many National Paſtors in a *Subaltern Sphere* of Government, or an *Oecumenic Paſtor* in a Supreme Catholic Juriſdiction muſt of neceſſity be inferr'd: For as yet there is as great and much greater need for a *principium unitatis & regiminis* in conjoyning many National Churches in one *Patriarchal*,

or

or all in one *Oecumenic*, as was for uniting *Provincials* in one *Primateſhip*, or for ſubjecting *Dioceſans* to their reſpective *Provincials*; for by how much the more Extenſive the Church is, by ſo much the more Univerſal the Paſtoral Charge ought to be: For as the *Dioceſan* is to the *Provincial*, ſo the *Provincial* to the *National*, and ſo the *National* to the *Patriarchal*, and that to the *Catholic*, and *Vice verſa* by a Mathematical proportion. Hence the like ground of relation as is between a *National Paſtor*, and *National Church*, is alſo betwixt a *Catholic Paſtor*, and *Catholic Church*, and if Unity, Uniformity, and Regular Adminiſtration be indiſpenſably neceſſary in a National Church, and therefore the Care and ſupreme Inſpection thereinto, to be commited to a *National Paſtor*, of how much higher concern is it in *Patriarchal Churches* conſiſting next of *National*, and how much more in the *Catholic Church* conſiſting immediately of *Patriarchats*, the Government and Managment whereof ought for thoſe Ends to be committed unto an *Oecumenic Paſtor*? For if a Schiſm or corruption of a Province or Dioceſe be ſo dangerous to a *National Church*, and to be prevented before it is, or cured after it breaks forth by a *National Paſtor*, of how much more pernicious conſequence will the Schiſm, or Non-conformity of a *Patriarchal* or *National* Church be to the *Catholic*, which by the ſame reaſons ought to be prevented, or judged and determined by an *Oecumenic Paſtor* for *univerſal good*?

Arg. 2. I prove, that they that maintain the Government of the Church by Biſhops, Arch-biſhops, Primates, *&c.* muſt alſo own and acknowledge an *univerſal viſible Paſtor*, *from the nature of an univerſal viſible Church.* Becauſe this Church muſt be an *Organized*, or *Un-organized* Body made up of *partes ſimilares* only; the later will not be granted by our Aſſertors, becauſe it lays a neceſſary Foun-

dation for *particular co-ordinate* Churches, Congregational, or Presbyterian. Beſides if the Catholic Church be conſidered in it's largeſt acceptation and extent, comprehending the *Militant* and *Triumphant* parts, the Scripture tells us, it's an *Organized Body*, being called a Body, of which the Lord Jeſus Chriſt is the *living head*; ſo *Eph.* 1. 22, 23. *Coloſ.* 1. 18, 24. *Eph.* 4. 12, 16. 1 *Cor.* 12. 27. None therefore will deny this *Catholic Church* to be an *Organized Body*, the notion whereof is conſiſtent enough with the opinion of ſuch as hold a *co-ordination* of particular viſible Churches and the Paſtors thereof, and enough to evince that they that hold the ſubordination pleaded for, muſt underſtand it to be in the viſible Church Organized; and therefore it's moſt natural and fit, that the *Mother Teeming Church* ſhould have the moſt proportionate Adaptation of parts: A Mother that brings forth *Organized Children* is ſuppoſed to be Organized her ſelf, *nihil dat quod non habet*; wherefore all other leſs comprehenſive Churches coming out of the Womb of *Mother Church*, and proved to be organized Bodies, it's naturally neceſſary that ſhe her ſelf ſhould be *homogeneous*, or of ſame kind, otherwiſe the Mother muſt be more Monſtrous than the Daughters. Beſides, particular Churches are conſidered not only as Daughters to *Mother Catholic*, but as *integral parts*; now therefore, that Body which is made up of *Organized parts*, is always it ſelf *Organized*: *e.g.* in all Animals, in a Man the Head, Hand, Legs, *&c.* are each Organized for their compleating the Totality of that part, and therefore are becoming Organs to the whole Man, and hence the Man is an organized Body.

Again, the Viſible Catholic Church muſt be ſuch, *quatenus integrum*, or *quatenus genus*; for *totum* is moſt legally thus divided; and as for *Totum aggregatum* it is but *integrum*, *viz.* a whole Heap of Corn is but *Totum integrum*, tho' every

every Grain of Wheat is integral to the Heap, of this or that bigneſs, or number of Grains, from whence the Individuality properly flows. But, to proceed, both theſe acceptations of a Catholic Church enforce a Catholic Paſtor.

1. As *Catholicum integrum*, and *quatenus tale*, it is to be conſidered as diviſible, or divided into parts; and, according to the right Notion of *Subordination*, the whole is divided into the next, but greater parts, and they into the next leſſer, and they into leſſer, or leaſt of all. Wherefore the *Catholic* Viſible Church is divided into *Patriarchal*, (where they be to be found) and they into *National*; but where they are not found, National ſtand in the next Rank and Order under the *Oecumenic*, as the greateſt conſtituting parts; *National* are divided into *Provincial*; *Provincial* into *Dioceſan*, and they into *Parochial*; and if there be a *Subordination* of Paſtors, it's according to the *Subordination* and *Extenſion* of Churches, the integral parts. For in diviſion and ſubdiviſion of parts, there muſt be *terminus à quo & ad quem. Maximum quod ſic, & minimum quod ſic.* But there can be no Subordination of Paſtors, according to the Subordination of *Membra totius*, without an *Univerſal Paſtor*. For there is the ſame reſpect of an *Oecumenic* to a *Patriarch*, and in defect thereof to a *Primate*, as of a *Primate* to a *Provincial*; for the whole Catholic Church is divided into *Patriarchal*, and (they ceaſing) into *National*, in the ſame manner as *National* are divided into *Provincial*, *& ſic deinceps*: And, as the National Church is a *totum* in reſpect to the Provincial, and as ſuch hath *a Paſtor*; ſo the *National* is but a *Membrum* in reſpect of the *Catholic*, the *Totum*, which by the ſame reaſon ought to have a Paſtor with Power adequate to it, or elſe this *concatenation* will be *Headleſs*, and viſibly deficient in its *Polity*, for an uniform Conſtitution.

Now,

Now, if it be ſaid that the Catholic Church is but a *totum aggregatum*, and therefore that National Churches are *Co-ordinate* only; I ſay, that a *totum aggregatum* is an *integrum* in its kind, being compoſed of *intregral* parts; and if the *aggregatum* be ſuch, that every part hath *ſubordinate* parts in it ſelf, then each Individual is ſubordinated to the Whole, which is organiz'd alſo; as an Army of a Thouſand Men is an *integrum* made up of Individuals; but all and every one being an *integral part*, it's ſubordinated to the Whole, which *integrum* hath a *General* conſtituted to it.

Again, if men ſay that *National Churches* are *particular independent Churches*, ſubordinated to none; then *Provincial* and *Dioceſan* at leaſt, upon the ſame grounds, may lay claim to the ſame Plea, and call themſelves *independent Churches*; whence the whole Fabric of *National Prelatic* Church-Government will fall to the ground. But how inconſiſtent theſe Principles are, let the Reader judge; to deny the Subordination of a *National Church* to the *Catholic Roman*, from whence they avowedly derive their *Ordination* and *Miniſtry*, and to maintain and practiſe a *Subordination* of Churches and Paſtors to the National, utterly diſclaiming and condemning *Independency* of Churches as *Schiſmatical* in the Diſſenters.

Laſtly, If the Catholic Viſible Church be taken for *totum genericum*, it muſt be *genus generaliſſimum* to all viſible Churches; and the Subordination under this *totum genericum* ſtands thus; The *Patriarchal*, or (in defect thereof) the *National*, is *ſubalternum genus*, in reſpect of the *Provincial*, but *ſubalterna ſpecies*, in reſpect of the Catholic. And the Argument ſtands thus:

If a *Paſtor* is to be conſtituted over a Church *ſubalterni generis*, becauſe it contains Churches under it, as *ſpecies*; then by the ſame reaſon, a *Paſtor* is to ſit over the Catholic the

the *totum generiсum*; and the rather, becauſe it contains not ſome *ſpecies* only, but all.

This Notion I'll not further proſecute, becauſe, according to the beſt Logical and Theological Rules, the Application of a *Genus*, doth not ſo well ſuit the Nature of a Catholic Church, it being more properly an *Integrum*, than a *Genus*.

Arg. 3. I argue from the *Nature of Subordination* it ſelf, of any kind, which always ſuppoſeth a *Supremum & Infimum*; for *Subordination* is a *continuation* of Ranks and Degrees, linked together in *Superiority* and *Inferiority*, betwixt theſe two terms: And if there be in the Church a Subordination of Paſtors, as our Proteſtant Prelates aſſert, then there is, and muſt be, the *Supreme*, as well as the *loweſt term*, *viz.* a *Catholic Paſtor*, for the higheſt Range, or Round of the Ladder, and a *Pariſh Prieſt*, or (as our Biſhops would have it of late) a *Dioceſan*, for the loweſt, the continuation being always to a *ne plus ultra* at both ends of the Line. And this *continuation*, as it muſt not be *infinite*, ſo it ought to be *juſt* to reach to its due limits; and, as it is a *Church-line*, it is to be found where-ever there is a *Church*. Hence theſe Gradual Orders of Paſtors muſt be continued from the loweſt to the higheſt and largeſt acceptation of a *Church* and *Paſtor* on Earth, for the maintaining of a *Central radical Unity*, and *Univerſal Uniformity* throughout the World, in and among all *National Churches*, being next in Conſtitution where the Patriarchal, the proper *Subaltern Order*, is become *obſolete*, as it is very much in the more Weſtern parts of the World. Now, it can't terminate in a *National Paſtor*, for then it would follow, that this Subordination pleaded for by our Proteſtant Prelates, would revolve into a *Co-ordination of Paſtors*, at leaſt *National*, which will be conceſſion enough to Diſſenters to ground their Profeſſion and Practice upon

upon in Congregational Paſtors and Churches; for hereby *National Churches* are made *co-ordinate* and *independent*; and if one ſort of Church may be ſo, why may not another? For, break but the Rules of a Catholic Subordination, and all the Wit of Man cannot pretend to any rational Fabric of Churches, beſides Co-ordination: I challenge the whole Race of Mankind to propound any Medium, that will not be eaſily proved idle and frivolous. Now, if *National co-ordination* in Supremacy may take place, without paying any *Canonical Obedience* to any Superior Head, this lays a firm Foundation for the like Claim in all others, calling themſelves *Paſtors* of an *Inferior* Rank and Order, and there cannot be any *Independency* of a greater magnitude, and more dangerous conſequence; for it brings in as many Popes as there are Nations, who will uncontroulably exerciſe all ſorts of Church-Tyranny; *experientia docet*. And why may not an *Archbiſhop* or *Dioceſan* ſet up for himſelf too upon the ſame ground? So that we ſhall come at laſt to a *Presbytery of Paſtors*, our *Proteſtant Prelates* having made Dioceſan Biſhops the loweſt Order of Paſtors in the Church. The ſum of this whole Argument is, That there can be no plauſible reaſon given, why the *Subordination* of viſible Paſtors ſhould not extend to the utmoſt limits of the *Viſible Church*, if it be neceſſary in any one Church comprehending others: And if Chriſt hath ſet *Orb* within *Orb*, and every one his *Planetary Paſtor* to rule it, why ſhould the *Supreme Catholic viſible Orb* be without its Planet?

Arg. 4. The neceſſity of the Inference is further ſhewed from the *Derivation and Original of Paſtoral Office-Power*. Every Paſtor doth or ſhould receive his Office-Power from Chriſt, either *mediately* or *immediately*: If Subordinate Paſtors, *mediately*, and that *mediante populo, vel mediante ſuperiori quodam Paſtore*. The Aſſertors of Prelacy will never yield

yield a derivation of Office-Power from Christ *mediante populo*, for that were to open a gap to Congregational *Dissenters* with a witness. If they say they derive their Office-Power from Christ *mediante Pastore, aut Pastoribus*, then he or they must be *Co-ordinate*, or of a Superior Rank and Order. *Not Co-ordinate*, for that were to assert *Presbytery* in plain terms. *Ergo*, They must and do say, That every Pastor receives his Office from Christ *mediante Superiori quodam Pastore*, and not from any *co-ordinate* to himself in the Office to which he is admitted. And if all Pastors of different Orders set over particular Churches of answerable comprehension, receive their Office-Power by the hands of the next Superior, then it's manifest that the *highest subaltern Pastor* receives his Power from the *Supreme Catholic Pastor*, or else he is no *Subordinate Pastor*, but the *Supreme* looked after. *e. g.* The *Parish-Priest* receives the Office of a Priest from his Diocesan, who is by Consecration constituted such by his *Provincial*, and He derives his Power from his *Metropolitan*: the *Primate* then, by the same reason, must receive his National *Pastoral Staff* from some higher *Pastor*, or else he becomes the *Supreme Pastor*, above which there is no ascending on this *Church-Ladder*. Now, if so, each Primate is Christ's *immediate Vicar* in that Nation where he presides; for it must be so, or he must receive his Power *mediately* by the hands of some other besides the *Universal Pastor*: and if so, then by the *co-ordinate Power* of some other National Pastor or Pastors, and consequently will produce a *Presbytery of Metropolitans*, which may prove of a most fatal consequence to the *Catholic Church*. For if a *Presbytery*, combined in ordinary Power, *Classical* or otherwise, tho' made up of *Ordinary Priests*, be so dangerously pernicious to a *National Church*, as appears by our late Covenanters, and by other instances sufficiently known; how much

reaſon have we to believe, that nothing can wound the *Catholic Church*, more than a *Presbytery* or *Combination of Metropolitans*, and have we not ſeen the direful effect of the *Proteſtant Prelates Combination* for caſting off the *Catholic Paſtors Juriſdiction*, whilſt they Eſtabliſh their own *arbitrarineſs*, *and Tyrannical Impoſitions* to the ruin of the Eſtates and Lives of Thouſands of his Majeſties poor Subjects?

Laſtly, If a *Metropolitan* be inveſted with his Power by his Inferiors or Equals, he receives it in a meaner and more contemptible way than any of his *ſubordinate Clergy*, for they are all inveſted by their Superiors: Likewiſe if a *co-ordinate Clergy* of one kind can beſtow Office Power, why may not a *co-ordinate Clergy* of another? If *Metropolitans* can make a Metropolitan, Why may not *Provincials* make a *Provincial*; *Dioceſans a Dioceſan*, and *Prieſts a Prieſt*? And ſo all the whole *Model* of Epiſcopacy will reſolve into *Presbytery*; and *Presbyterian Ordination* muſt be as valid as any the Biſhops can beſtow, which hath been roundly denyed by our *Proteſtant Prelates*: Inſomuch, that thoſe that have conform'd who had only *Presbyterian Ordination*, were fain to be *re-ordained* by the Biſhops before they were received to the exerciſe of their *Miniſterial Function* in the Church of *England*.

Arg. 5. We may argue from the chief ends *of ſubordination of Paſtors in the Church*, *viz.* That there may be place for appeal in matters of controverſie, in caſes of *male-adminiſtration* by the ſubordinate Clergy, *final determination of difficult Eccleſiaſtical cauſes*, *correction of Hereſie and Schiſm*, as alſo *Eſtabliſhment of Ceremonies*, *&c.* Now to what end ſhould there be Appeals if there be not ſome *Supreme Catholic* Paſtor to arrive at, in whoſe determination, we are bound to ſit down and reſt ſatisfied? *viz.* where the mind of the whole *Catholic Church* may be had in the *Principium unitatis*

unitatis if the Appeal can aſcend no higher than a National Paſtor, then he challengeth that *infallibility*: but in him we have not the mind of the whole *Catholic Church*, it's but the mind of one *particular independent Church*, and why ſhould he not be guilty of as much imperfection and partiality as a *Provincial* or *Dioceſan*? Unleſs there be degrees of Infallibility, which if admitted, we muſt ariſe to the higheſt. If the reſort for reſolution and determination for appeal be to a *Paſtoral multiplicity*, no final determination is likely to be made, by reaſon of variety of judgments, or intereſts and will introduce co-ordination of Paſtors, and a Ruling Presbytery of one ſize or another. For any binding Aſſemblies, (let them be called what you will, Councils or Convocation, *&c.*) if they have conſtraining Power to inforce their *Edicts*, *Eccleſiaſtical or Civil*, without a Ratification from a *Catholic Paſtoral Supremacy*, are but *Presbyteries* in the true nature of them, for it's a Government of the Church by a *co-ordinate Power* of Paſtors. Whereas if the *appeal* arrive at the *Oecumenic Paſtor*, you hear but one thing ſpoken by the Catholic Church, by one Man in it's *Catholic Paſtor* or *Head*: for if we will know a Mans mind we muſt reſort to the Head, not to the Arms or Legs, where you can only expect a *dumb kick*, or *box under the Ear*, as we have had enough of, from our *Proteſtant Prelates*; ſo if we will underſtand the mind of the Church, we are not to betake our ſelves to a *Dioceſan*, *Provincial*, or *Primate*, which are but the Church's *more ſurly and leſs intelligible Organs*, where we can expect but a weak and partial reſolution confirmed by *Club Arguments*, none of theſe having *Catholic intelligence*, *influence*, or *concernment*, being bound up to narrower Souls the greateſt of them for the moſt part, than ever the cure of the leaſt of them was; but for ſuch things as theſe we muſt apply our ſelves to the *Body* ſpeaking in the *Head* (not

a fictitious one or uſurped) having *Natural Organization, relation, influence, and common concern*, yea *fellow-feeling* with all the parts, even the *leaſt Finger and Toe*; and reſtrains all exorbitant actions of the *more brutal* parts and paſſions, ſubjecting them to the noble faculties of the *rational Soul*. As for the pretenſions made by the *Catholic Paſtor* to Infallibility, they are founded on the principles of the Epiſcopal Conſtitution, for an *Epiſcopal Church* (ſetled by ſubordination of Paſtors within it ſelf,) without a *Catholic Head*, is an *Animal* without a Head. In all our *appeals* from *Paſtor* to *Paſtor*, from *Church* to *Church*, in any cauſes or Controverſies, we do not ſtill come to a *leſs fallible Church and Paſtor*, and at laſt arrive at the moſt *Infallible comprehenſive of our ſelves* as Members, *cui bono hic Labor & hoc Opus?* For if it be granted, that a Biſhop is leſs fallible than a *Pariſh Prieſt*, and an Arch-biſhop *leſs fallible* than a *Biſhop*, and a *Primate* than he, then upon the ſame ground we may expect the Catholic Paſtor to be *leſs fallible* than *all the reſt*, and it may be ſuppoſed (tho' he be a Man and in himſelf fallible) that he, that hath a *common relation, intereſt, and comprehenſiveneſs* of Power above all, is beſt acquainted with the State of the whole, and is likely to be more *impartial* and *leſs fallible* in his judgment than any other of his inferior, *narrowed* and *limited* Clergy, therefore he muſt be comparatively *infallible, i. e. leaſt fallible* in the *line* of the ſubordinated Clergy, he being placed there by them as *principium unitatis & veritatis*, in order to the greateſt Church concerns. Not, but that the *Oecumenic Paſtor* in his *human capacity* may miſtake and Err, and ſo did St. *Peter*, but not fundamentally, yet as ſupreme head in his *Catholic capacity (quatenus in Cathedrâ Catholicâ, & comparativè)* to all inferior ſubordinated Paſtors, he hath a kind of *Infallibility*, which is a Power intruſted in him by the *Catholic*

tholic Church, to paſs a final judgment of determination in all cauſes and Controverſies, to be a *ne plus ultra* to all appeals and litigations in the Church. Not that we are bound *ſub pœnâ damni* to believe ſuch judgment is Infallibly true, but are to ſubſcribe to it as the *laſt*, becauſe we cannot have any further, and *higher appeal* on Earth, and therefore muſt ſit down ſatisfied in it. The Engliſh Clergy do ſubſcribe the *Thirty Nine Articles* Eſtabliſhed by Law, not that they believe them (as they commonly ſay) to be true and Orthodox, but becauſe they be the laſt reſolutions of the Church of *England* in thoſe points, they ſit down ſatisfied to ſubſcribe them as *inſtrumenta pacis & unitatis*, but indeed, *maximè emolumenti*, upon the ſame ground they may ſubſcribe to the Council of *Trent*.

But to our purpoſe, it's not to be ſuppoſed that the *Catholic Church* would commit the greateſt charge to a perſon of the leaſt judgment and underſtanding, but ſuppoſing her to fail here, the *neceſſity of appeal* infers, that it's not uſually ſo: For to what purpoſe is it for us to betake our ſelves for further light to thoſe whom the Church hath entruſted with a *higher power* and *larger truſt*, if we have no reaſon to judge them not only to be *Holyer*, *Wiſer* and *Juſter* Men than thoſe that we appeal from, but *leſs fallible* in judgment and *Errable in practice*? would you not have me *concluded* by the judgment of a Proteſtant Biſhop ſooner than by the judgment of a Common Prieſt, and do you not tell me the Church requires it of you? and why ſhould not I upon the like ground be *concluded* by the *Oecumenic Biſhop* ſooner than by a *Common Dioceſan*, yea than by any *Primate* of them all, becauſe the Church recommends me to him for the laſt reſolution, and I am to ſuppoſe him to be able to out-ſhoot all Men beſides, in the Eccleſiaſtic Bows?

Arg. 6. That this *Catholic headſhip* is inſeparable from an

an *Eccleſiaſtic Body* made up of *ſubordinated Paſtors and Churches* may be abundantly evinced from theſe following enumerated Church-neceſſities.

The neceſſity, 1. of a *Catholic Judgment of Schiſm*; 2. *of a Catholic Interpretation of Scripture*; 3. *of a Catholic determination of Ceremonies for Decency and Order*; 4. for *Catholic compoſure of Forms of Prayer*; 5. for *a Catholic Canonization of Saints*; 6. *a Catholic call and convention of Councils Oecumenic.*

1. The neceſſity of a *Catholic Judgment of Schiſm*; for if *Schiſm* be not determined by a *Catholic Judgment*, theſe abſurdities will follow. For, 1. *Patriarchal*, or (in defect of them) *National Churches* may be *Schiſmatical*, and no competent remedy be found for the ſaid *Schiſm*; for it's not fit any particular Church ſhould be its own *Judge* in *its own caſe*, nor any of but *equal Authority*, *Latitude*, and *Fallibility*. One particular Church can no more judge another that ſtands in the *ſame Degree* with it *of Subordination*, than one man can judge another, one Gentleman another, or one Lord another; neither may a *Provincial* judge a *National*, being *inferior* and *ſubordinate* to it. The leſſer have no power to judge the greater. A part that is not the *Head*, may not judge the Whole; for a *Provincial* is accountable to a *National*, but not *vice verſâ*. And if a *Provincial* declares againſt a *National* Church of which ſhe is part, and ſeparates from it, ſhe is juſtly condemned, by the National, of *Schiſm*, and ſo the Schiſm and Judgment will be *reciprocal* only, but no *cure* wrought without a *Catholic Deciſion* that may be binding to both. 2. Without a *Catholic Paſtor* there can be no determination of a *Schiſm* from the Catholic Church, nor any proportionate puniſhment of it; for what proceeding can be *judicially* againſt a *Patriarchate* or *National Church* falling into Schiſm, but by an *Oecumenic Judicatory*, over which

which the Supreme Paſtor doth preſide? For one *Patriarch* will not be convened before another who is *co-ordinate* in Power, nor one *Primate* before another. 3. As a ſuperior and more comprehenſive Church is to adjudge the inferior and comprehended; ſo no particular Church, how comprehenſive ſoever, hath an abſolute *definitive* Power in it ſelf, by the Rules of *Subordination*: but whatever *Sentence* any particular Paſtor or Church paſſeth on another, there lies an *Appeal* againſt it to the Catholic Church and Paſtor, higher than which none can go on Earth. 4. If there be not a *Catholic Determination* of Schiſm, particular Churches will not be agreed about it; but the very Diſputes about the nature of *Schiſm*, where and when it is, will make Schiſms without end, and one Church will ſpit at another as *Schiſmatical* upon all occaſion, as it is now at this day among the Proteſtants; the *Sect of Common-prayer-men* charge all the Diſſenters with *Schiſm*; the *Presbyterians* charge the *Independents*; and both theſe, it may be, the *Baptiſts*; the *Papiſts* call them *All* ſo. Who ſhall determin where the Schiſm lies? *One* or *All* muſt be *Schiſmatics*. There is nothing can do in this caſe, but a *Catholic binding Determination*, that can *charm* all theſe Parties in finding out the Schiſm where it is, convincing and reforming it; and preventing it where it is not. For if the Members of a Natural Body complain of and accuſe one another, the whole Body muſt end the Controverſie by determining the matter in and by the *Head*, wherein there is a *general concurrence* of all parts for the good of the Whole, to maintain a *common Intereſt*. Thus it is in the *Body Politic*, Civil, or Eccleſiaſtic. Therefore, that all men may know *what* is Schiſm, and *who* are Schiſmatics, and who *not*, it's needful there be ſome *Catholic Determination* that may clear up all Controverſies and Doubts of this nature, that every thing or perſon may be called by the right name, *i. e.* agreeable

able to their Nature; as *Adam* named the Creatures at firſt. Now, we might ſoon have this *Reformation* (or *Reſtitution* rather) of all things; but ſuch is the pravity and contradiction that is rooted in the Nature of Mankind, ſince the Fall, that the World cannot be gotten to agree upon this way, every one being inclin'd to believe themſelves before the Church. And it hath been the unhappy Fate of the Church of *England* to be juſtly chargeable by the *Papiſts* with thoſe Crimes ſhe chargeth, condemneth, and puniſheth the Diſſenters for; and when ſhe is to fight with the *Papiſts*, muſt go down to the Diſſenters Camp to borrow Weapons, wherewith they defended themſelves againſt the Church of *England*.

2*dly*. From the neceſſity of a *Catholic reſolution of difficult and dubious places of Scripture*; for this (tho' Epiſcopal Divines tell the Diſſenters, That this is done by the *Church*, meaning their Church *eſtabliſhed by its own Law*) can't be done but by the *Catholic Church*, where the concurrent Judgment and Faith of all Churches may be heard. Scripture is not of *private Interpretation*, ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως, 2 *Pet.* 1. 20. The Scriptures *meaning* is not as every particular private perſon or Church *means*, nor is ſquared only to private mens *minds* or *intereſts*, but is of *common concern*, and contains a *Univerſality* in it, which is called the *Analogy of Faith*, and with this doth moſt naturally agree the *Unction* or Spirit of Truth, that runs thro' the hearts of all Believers, and makes them *taſt and ſavor* the ſame things. Now, it's not any ſingular Opinion, or Judgment of a particular Church, can ſatisfie in this caſe, but a *Catholic Agreement*, which muſt be found out ſomewhere or other.

Again, if *particular Churches*, or their *Paſtors*, have Power to declare the ſenſe of Scripture as the mind of the Church; the Church will ſoon have as many *Minds* as *Paſtors*, of various

rious Sentiments in it, or particular Churches of divers complexions; and hereby the Church will become *felo de se*, to lay an inevitable Foundation for variety of *Sects*, *Schisms*, *Errors* and *Heresies*. And the more *comprehensive* the Church is that lays claim to, and executes this Power, of the more *dangerous* consequence it is to the *Catholic Church*: For an Error, or Heresie, propagated and received by a Province or Nation, must needs be more destructive to the *Catholic Mother* than if it had *tainted* a *Diocese* or *Parish* only; as the Natural Body can spare a Finger or Toe, better than a Leg or Arm. Whereas if all National Churches be bound to submit to the *Catholic Determination* of dubious and difficult senses, there must needs ensue this admirable effect, That no Church or Member will pretend to be *wiser* than their Neighbors in this matter, but the Learned and Unlearned, the Wise man and the Fool, will be of an equal dimension: They must all believe as the Church doth; and who is likely to have the most *unerring Spirit*, a Church, or a particular Member of it? And of Churches, which is in probability *least fallible*, a particular or the Catholic Church? This, of the two, all will suppose to be the most likely to have the *Analogy of Faith*, and truest sense of the Word, provided there be a way of getting a distinct knowledge of her *consonant mind* and *determination* in such matters.

3*dly*. From the necessity of a *Catholic determination of Decency and Order*: For that is always *decent* which the Universality reckons and reputes so, in Gestures, Vestures, Circumstances of Time and Place, *&c.* in all things Civil or Ecclesiastic; and therefore the *Universality* must determine it, if such *Decencies* be by Law enjoyned. It's most absurd that particular men or Churches should pretend to determine of *Decencies* and *Order*; for then one Church will esteem this or that thing *decent* in the Worship of God, which ano-

ther reckons abſurd; as the Church of *England* will make that *decent*, which *France* or *Spain* will make undecent. Hereby *Uniformity* (whatſoever there is in the particular Church) is loſt in the *Catholic Church*, where it's moſt neceſſary to be had; And when a Church determines of, and requires Decencies, we preſently ſay, What Church? If it be ſaid a Dioceſan, we rejoyn, Doth the Dioceſan, determine for her ſelf, or for others? If for her ſelf only, then it's Plenipotentiary within it ſelf, and may *Non-conform* from all her Siſter-Dioceſans at pleaſure in thoſe things: And if for others, then which of them ſhall give Law to the reſt? And all will ſurely be impoſed upon, and all become Impoſers; and this is the way to ſet all the World together by the ears. The Inference holds, as well of Provincial and National Churches. Thus alſo, if *Dioceſans* may determine their own *Decencies and Order*, what will become of *Uniformity* in the *Provincial Churches*? And if *Provincial Churches* may determine *their Decencies*, what will become of *Uniformity* in the *National Church*? And if every National Church may find out New Decencies, or enforce any Old or New, by her particular Law-Power, what will become of *Uniformity in the Catholic Church*, or Her Power to enjoyn it? And is not *Uniformity in the Catholic Church* of a thouſand times more concern than Uniformity in any one ſingle *independent Church*, let it be National or other? And all Uniformity in a particular Church pleaded for, is to be rejected and abhorred, when it is ſo far from being conſiſtent with, as that it's abſolutely deſtructive of *Catholic Uniformity*. For National Uniformity, unleſs it be of a Catholic Nature, is but *Uniformity in a Schiſm*. Is it not notorious that the impoſing this *fallacious* Uniformity hath filled the Nation with all the *Hurly-burlies* of this hundred years laſt paſt; that hath infeſted Church and State, cauſed all the Diviſions and Diſſen-

tions

tions in Societies and Families, all the decays of Trade, ſtirred up the minds of men to a diſguſt of the Government; been the true procatarctic cauſe of all that uneaſie temper of mind, which the zealous Impoſers have called Diſloyalty, and branded all Diſſenters with; and is that which hath ſo inceſſantly animated our Governors againſt ſo conſiderable a part of the ſober, trading, and induſtrious, yea thinking and truly Religious people of this Land? But the Clergies wrapping up of their *Hierapicra Pill of Uniformity in the golden Leaf of Loyalty*, (the refuſing of which rendred all Diſſenters odious to the State) is that jugling trick by which they have from time to time impoſed on King and Parliament, and brought the people into more *diſreliſh* of the Government, than all the Methods whatſoever, that any *Malecontents* ever uſed, ſince Proteſtant Religion had a name in *England*.

Again, if any Church may definitely determine of *Decencies and Order in Ceremonies*, beſides the Catholic Church, then any particular Church may, and if ſome, and not all, let thoſe Churches be aſſigned that have a peculiar *Charter* for it from Chriſt, or the Catholic Church. If they ſay that a National Church hath, then, either by virtue of ſome ſuch Charter, which I challenge them to ſhew, or as claiming a Catholic Power; And if ſo, why doth not that Nation exert it over other Nations? Or, laſtly, as a *Privilege* of a particular Church? And if ſo, then every Church hath a juſt claim to the ſaid Power, and it will follow, that a Provincial Church may deviſe and impoſe her own Decencies and Order in Ceremonies and Modes of Worſhip: If ſo, what will become of *National Uniformity?* Likewiſe the ſame Privilege belongs to a *Dioceſan*, as a particular Church: And if ſo, what will become of *Provincial Uniformity*? Whence it manifeſtly follows, that a true Uniformity in decent Ceremonies and Church-Order can no way be attain-

ed, if not by the Decrees of the *Catholic Church*, for which we muſt be beholding to the *Keeper of St.* Peter's *Keys*; for that *Panacæa* is ſo great an *Arcanum*, that it's not to be obtained of any but the greateſt *Adept* in the Catholic Church.

Laſtly, if every National Church may aſſume Power to themſelves to deviſe and impoſe their own Decencies and Ceremonies, as the *Bond of Uniformity* in the Church, all things muſt go *retrograde* in reſpect of the end aimed at. For, as all Nations have their peculiar Garbs, Faſhions, Uſages, Geſtures and Veſtures in Civil Affairs, ſo it muſt needs be in the Eccleſiaſtic; there will be the *Engliſh*, *French*, *Spaniſh*, *Dutch*, *Italian Modes of Worſhip*, quite different, Ceremonies quite of a contrary Nature to one another; ſo that there will be no end of multiplying Ceremonies and new-fangled Garbs in the Church; every *National Forge* will be ſtill at work to *coyn*, *uncoyn*, and alter at pleaſure: whereas if all this Work be left to the Catholic Church only, all Churches will harmoniouſly agree in the ſame ſort of Documents, which is the Uniformity contended for.

4*ly*. It follows from the neceſſity of a *Catholic Canonization of Saints*; for ſuppoſing a neceſſity of a due Obſervation of *Saints-days*, which the Church of *England* hath always inſiſted on and pleaded for; it is to be enquired, Who or what Church canonized the Saints they aſcribe *Saintſhip* to, & have *ſolemn Feſtivals* eſtabliſh'd for the honorable remembrance of? Who dedicated the Churches, and conſecrated them as they now ſtand, to the Devotion of reſpective dead Saints? Was it not the Catholic Church? And reaſon ſhews us, that it's in no wiſe fit that any other *Canonization* or Dedication ſhould be eſteemed authentic, but that which is of a *Catholic Nature*. For if this were in the power of any particular Church, National, Provincial, or other, theſe Abſurdities would follow; 1. A whole Age would be too little for *Alhollandtide* given

given out by retail. 2. There would be a neceſſity of robbing *Peter* to pay *Paul*; and it's as great a ſin to chouſe *Peter* of his *Fiſhing-nets*, as *Paul* of his *Cloak* and *Parchments*. 3. One Church would *canonize* that man for a *Saint and Martyr*, which another had ſtigmatized for a Traytor, Heretic, and Devil; and what an irreparable breach would this make in Uniformity? 4. The groſs *Schiſm* that this will cauſe in the Church, dividing it in its Prayers at the ſame time, when one Nation ſhall obſerve a Day to St. *Thomas*, another the ſame to St. *Nicholas*, a third to St. *Benedict*, and a fourth to none at all: would not this be a horrid *clutter* and *confuſion* in the Church, making it a meer *Babel*, in confounding its Language, beſides the manifold ſmaller abſurdities that Church-worſhip would run upon?

Fifthly, From the neceſſity of a *Catholic compoſure of Church Prayers*. For the more private and ſingular the conception and compoſure of Church Prayers are, the more *factious* and *Schiſmatical*, ſay our Clergy, and if a diverſity of Liturgies in one and the ſame National Church may not be allowed, being totally deſtructive to *National Uniformity*; then how can ſo many *Liturgies* be permitted to be in the Catholic Church without the like, and a great deal worſe miſchief? And if a *Provincial* or *Dioceſan Church* may not compoſe a diſtinct *Liturgy* from the National, how comes it to paſs, that the National can compoſe and rigorouſly impoſe a diſtinct Liturgy from other *National Churches* and *the Catholic*; is not this an *Innovation* of the moſt dangerous conſequence? And is our Church a fit judge of *Schiſm* in thoſe ſhe calls diſſenters, which hath laid the foundation of all her Government and Worſhip in the higheſt and moſt *Exemplary Schiſm*, and deſtruction of *Catholick Uniformity*, at the ſame time when they furiouſly cut down all that will not ſubmit to their *National Diana*, with the

Ec-

Eccleſiaſtic and Magiſtratic Swords? Now who I pray cannot ſee the *cheat*? Oh here's a great cry in the world, that the bowels of the Church are torn out, her Children are rebellious and will not conform to her *Liturgy* and *Form of Church Worſhip*, &c. And what Church is this that the Salvation of the World doth thus depend upon? Its one poor pitiful *Independent Church*, a Church that will be Govern'd by none but her ſelf, that is *ſingular* in her Prayers, and takes upon her to *ſeparate in Church Government* and *Prayers* from all her Neighboring National Churches, that hath ſet up and profeſſed a *National Separation* from the *Catholic Church* in whoſe Belly ſhe was conceived, and who brought her forth, and in whoſe Arms, at whoſe Breaſts and on whoſe Knees ſhe was brought up, and at the ſame time deals moſt cruelly with her own Children for pleading for, and Practiſing ſeparation from her: and may any one *particular Church* ſeparate from the *Catholic* without Schiſm, and may not another? May a National, and may not a Provincial, and Dioceſan, yea Parochial? For if there be a danger in *Separation* among theſe particular Churches, is not the *Separation* of a National (being the greateſt, and moſt comprehenſive of all the reſt) moſt dangerous of all?

The way to cure the preſent Diviſions and Diſtractions in matters of this Nature, according to the true principles of *Church Uniformity* pleaded for by our Clergy, is this, That all Diſſenting National Churches bring their *Liturgies and Forms of Public Service*, and lay them down at the Feet of *Mother Catholica*, ſubmitting them Candidly to the Reformation and Recompoſure of the Supreme head, which muſt neceſſarily produce a uniting of all particular National Churches to the Univerſal, and bring them to the greateſt Uniformity and Harmonious agreement among themſelves. Oh, how would all conjoyn in the ſame *individual Petitions*

at

at the ſame *Canonical hours*! And what a *Catholic Amen*, would the Heavens Ring with, louder than if all the Clocks in *London* were made conformable to *Bow*, and ſtruck at the ſame Moment? And then a Man might be ſure to joyn exactly in his Prayers with all the *Saints* in the World, yea in the ſame *individual petitions*, and words at the ſame Moment, Oh, bleſſed Uniformity! will not this be much better than a *National Uniformity*, that we have had ſo much a Sputter about to the diſturbance of this Poor Nation for this Hundred Years? So that all the World wondred what was the matter with us, but it's found at laſt, that the cauſe of all our Calamities hath been our Clergies ſtrenuous contending for Uniformity in a National Schiſm.

Sixthly, We argue from the Neceſſity *of calling, convening and diſſolving Oecumenical Councils*; in whoſe Power is it to convene an *Oecumenical Council*, if there be no Univerſal Paſtor? For ſuch an Aſſembly muſt be a Church-Aſſembly, elſe it can claim no Power in the Church, and all *Church Aſſemblies* are of right convened by the *Paſtor of* the ſaid Church wherein it is, as in a *Dioceſe*, the *Clergy* is convened by the *Authoritative call* of the Biſhop. In a *Province* who can Aſſemble a *Provincial Synod* but the *Arch-biſhop?* And ſure in a *National Church* it belongs to the *Primate* by Office to convene a *National Aſſembly*, or *Convocation*, in all which Conventions the reſpective Paſtor ſtill *preſides*. That any Church of theſe kinds permits any of the ſaid conventions to be made by a *foreign* or ſecular Power, is frivolous here to Object; for the *Primate* hath as much Power to Aſſemble a *Parliament* as the Supreme Magiſtrate *juridicè* to *Aſſemble* a Church Convention; for he cannot *jure* exerciſe any part of a *Paſtoral Office*, and it is ſuch to *convene* Church Aſſemblies. And *Oecumenical Councils* being the moſt eminent *Councils*, are not

to

to be convened in a more *irregular* and *exotic* way, than the Aſſemblies of *inferior* and *ſubordinate* Churches, for if the Aſſemblies of each of theſe ought to be called and continued by their Paſtors according to their reſpective Orders and Conſtitutions, as a *Dioceſan*, *Dioceſanly*, *a Provincial Provincially*, and a *National Nationally*; then a *Catholic Aſſembly Catholicè*, if all Church Aſſemblies are called by their reſpective Paſtors, then this, *viz.* an *Oecumenic Council* muſt be called in the like manner, *i. e.* by a *Paſtor* adequate and appropriate to it. If it be ſaid, that *National Paſtors* may Aſſemble by conſent to conſtitute an *Oecumenical Council* together with others of a more *inferior rank*; I ſay by the ſame reaſon may *Arch biſhops and Biſhops* convene by conſent to make a *Provincial Aſſembly*, without the *Authoritative* Call of the *Primate* to give *Sanction* to ſuch Aſſembly. It's not the bare Meeting together of Paſtors that makes a *Church Aſſembly*, and renders it *Authoritative* in it's degree or kind; for if ſo, every *convention* of Church Officers that might be made ſo by *themſelves*, is a *binding Governing* Power to the People, this would ſoon fill the World with endleſs confuſions, and therefore it's not every Council that will aſſume to it ſelf the Name of *Oecumenic*, can be allowed to be ſuch; but it is in this as in all other Church Aſſemblies of *ſubordinate rank*, *if* an *adequate Paſtor* call them, and gives lawful Summons to the reſpective Members thereof, the abſence of ſome, alters not the Nature of the ſaid Aſſembly, but the Paſtors authoritative call and precedence therein, gives unto it it's true Sanction. More might be ſaid to this purpoſe, but I will add nothing further at preſent, having, as I ſuppoſe, *ſufficiently proved the Aſſertion laid down, That ſubordination of Paſtors in the Church neceſſarily infers the Supremacy of an Univerſal Paſtor.*

FINIS.